The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1935 NUMBER 1052

Contents

The Week 315

Editorials

Why Not Abolish Child Labor? 318
Unshackling the Tax Power 319
Labor's Best Tool 320

General Articles

Facts About Faces: Secretary Wallace ..... Peggy Bacon 321
The Future in India ..... H. N. Brailsford 322
The Consumer Gets a Break ..... Jonathan Mitchell 324
Hot Oil ..... Wayne Gard 326
China Behind the Headlines ..... T. A. Bisson 328
Waking from Snow (verse) ..... John Lehmann 330
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 330
Other People's Money ..... John T. Flynn 331
The Reader (verse) ..... Wallace Stevens 332
On the Labor Front ..... William P. Mangold 333

Correspondence 334

Merry England ..... Stark Young 336

Books in Review

A Note on Marxian Criticism ..... Malcolm Cowley 337
The Founder of Pragmatism ..... John Dewey 338
Sin Becomes Symposium ..... Gertrude Almington 339
Boswell at One Remove ..... Robert Morss Lovett 339
Musa Dagh ..... Norbert Guterman 340
Books in Brief 340

The Week

IN PRELIMINARY discussions of the President's security program, it was assumed by its advocates that any attempt to obtain the enactment of an adequate system, with unemployment insurance on a national basis, would meet with such opposition as to delay the whole project. It now appears, as we expected, that precisely the contrary is the case. Congressional opposition centers about the fact that the bills are so parsimonious. Conservatives have lined up solidly behind them on the ground that they involve virtually no contribution from the federal treasury, and it is on this line that the President is fighting out the issue, attempting to close the door against the possibility of all liberalizing amendments. Questions of how much security is offered and of how effective the laws will be are subordinated to the effort to avoid using these measures in the least degree to redistribute income through the use of national taxation. Meanwhile it appears that a long and careful report by experts ity pointed out the defects of the administration's state-by-state program, advocated a national system, and advised that if such a system were not favored, the principle of federal grants-in-aid to the states would be preferable to the plan of the official measure now introduced. This report was hardly considered by the Cabinet committee, has not, so far as we can learn, been published, and would have been virtually suppressed if it had not been unearthed by Louis Stark of The New York Times. If the administration is compelled to give way to really unsound schemes it will have only itself to blame for not offering a better program. In any case it is far to the right on the whole matter.

ANOTHER example of that famous California justice seems to be brewing. Eighteen men and women are now being tried in Sacramento under the infamous criminal-syndicalism law, passed in California during the post-war anti-Red hysteria, and a dead letter for many years. The real crime of these eighteen defendants is not being Communists—which they are—but fighting for decent wages and working conditions among the itinerant agricultural workers who harvest the state's crops. The trial has opened in an atmosphere of intimidation and terrorism by the state's conservatives that offers little hope of a fair verdict. When the Communists announced that they intended to send representatives to Sacramento to picket the trials and protest the whole affair, the citizens of the community, according to news accounts, promptly revived the vigilante spirit and organized an emergency committee which, so we are promised, will be armed and will use its weapons, if necessary, "to prevent a Communist uprising." There is about as much danger of a Communist uprising in Sacramento as there is of a vigilante having any common sense—which is to say, none at all.

TOM MOONEY has no right to feel discouraged because the United States Supreme Court has refused to take jurisdiction in his case. The Court's decision amounts to saying that Mooney has still one legal step to take in California before bringing his case to the nation's highest tribunal. That step is to ask a writ of habeas corpus from the California State Supreme Court. Such a writ has al-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it, but this took place before the facts were known about the deliberate subornation of perjury by the prosecuting attorney. The language of the decision strongly suggests that the Justices believe the California Supreme Court should, and will, grant such a writ. If it does not, the case can again be brought to the Supreme Court, with every reasonable expectation that the decision will then be in favor of Mooney. If he is set free, either by action in California or in Washington, there is no reason why the same procedure should not be invoked on behalf of Warren K. Billings, convicted with Mooney and with an equal denial of justice. Behind the careful, legal language of the Supreme Court can be read a sharp rebuke to California justice. The Attorney-General of that state based his argument on the contention that "due process" is violated only if, by an act of the prosecuting attorney, a defendant is denied the opportunity to present evidence. On this point the decision says:

> . . . We are unable to approve this narrow view of the requirements of due process. That requirement, in safeguarding the liberty of the citizen against deprivation through the action of the state, embodied the fundamental conceptions of justice which lie at the base of our civil and political institutions.
>
> It is a requirement that cannot be deemed to be satisfied by mere notice and hearing if a state has contrived a conviction through the pretense of a trial which in truth is but used as a means of depriving a defendant of liberty through a deliberate deception of court and jury by the presentation of testimony known to be perjured. Such a contrivance by a state to procure the conviction and imprisonment of a defendant is as inconsistent with the rudimentary demands of justice as is the obtaining of a like result by intimidation.

JAPAN'S actions in regard to the Chinese province of Chahar bear an ominous resemblance to what she did in Jehol and before that, in Manchuria. A large force of Japanese and "Manchukuon" soldiers has massed along the western boundary of Jehol, which is the eastern boundary of Chahar. Once again it is explained that these troops are simply chasing bandits who had strayed across the line from Chahar. These bandits, it appears, are the troops of the provincial Governor; whether they really went across the border into Jehol, nobody knows. In the light of the past few years, there is good reason to fear that Japan intends to take over Chahar as she previously took Jehol and Manchuria. She is driving ahead steadily on her Asiatic policy; there is no reason to believe that all the protests of the Western Powers have had the slightest effect upon her intentions, or that anything short of military force can stop her—and even that would depend upon the highly dubious outcome of a war that would itself be a world catastrophe. It is no reassurance to note that Foreign Minister Koki Hirota has just made a conciliatory speech in which he invited the coöperation toward peace of China, particularly of Great Britain. Whenever Japan is getting ready to carve another slice off China, somebody in Tokyo makes a conciliatory speech. The coincidence is becoming disturbing.

IN AN editorial last week ("The Russian Executions"), we stated that Zinoviev and Kamenev had been exiled for their part in the recent activities in the Soviet Union. At the time we went to press all statements from Russia corroborated this report, but it now proves to have been false. Last week these men and a number of others were tried by the Special Council of the Commissariat for Internal Affairs. Zinoviev was given ten years in prison, Kamenev five, and seventeen other defendants received similar prison sentences. Seventy-eight individuals were exiled.

INCIDENTALLY, since several protests from our readers suggest that the purpose of our editorial of last week has been misunderstood, we should like to emphasize a few points. It is possible to oppose the action of the Soviet government in the cases of those executed on the ground that one disapproves of capital punishment under all circumstances, or that accused persons are always entitled to public, civil trials with all the customary safeguards against injustice. One must acknowledge, however, that it is not customary for revolutionary governments threatened by violence to act with such circumspection, and in this respect the Soviet government is no more culpable than most others. The main charge of the objectors is, furthermore, that the severity and secrecy were employed to get rid of mere political opponents by a reign of terror. We attempted to show that there is no evidence to support this charge and that judgment on it should be suspended until there is. One group was tried and punished for complicity, not in political opposition, but in an actual assassination. The other, and larger, group is said to consist, not of mere political opponents, but of conspirators hostile to the whole Soviet regime. The fact that the names of those executed were unknown before the event argues that they were not leaders of internal political opposition. And a different reason for secrecy exists in the fact that public trials might have involved an embarrassing international situation if, as the Soviet authorities contend, the accused were secretly in contact with the German Nazis.

APPARENTLY most Wall Street opinion has settled down to the conclusion that whatever the legal reasoning involved, a majority of the Supreme Court will not be so impractical in the face of realities as to uphold the validity of the gold clause, at least in private security issues. Though the total of such issues is unknown, it is certainly large enough so that a legal right on the part of the bondholders to receive a premium of almost 70 percent in terms of present currency would disorganize the whole

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
FOR PERSONAL USE ONLY - NOT FOR REPRODUCTION OR DISTRIBUTION

many prominent companies into bankruptcy. As for the government bonds, payment in such a case could conceivably be made by issues of new currency, which would have a marked inflationary effect. One way out of the dilemmas would be for the government promptly to restore the dollar to its old gold value. This would bring an immediate disorganization of the exchange markets, and put a damper on exports. It probably would make it more difficult to approach an international monetary understanding. It would involve also some price deflation, but much less than would be the case if devaluation had had more of the effect in raising prices anticipated by its advocates. The whole dispute is a commentary on the unreality of an economy based on the right of contract when that economy develops so many disequilibria as ours does. The debt burden already is too large and inflexible when prices fall; that an effort to protect the right of contract should threaten to make it still larger when the economic problem is to reduce it is an absurd anomaly.

IN HIGH dudgeon, the newspaper publishers of the nation are assembling in New York City next week to decide whether they should withdraw from their code. It would be pleasant to believe, as the publishers would like us to believe, that this extraordinary move is dictated solely by their great devotion to the freedom of the press and by their fear that this freedom has been transgressed by the National Labor Relations Board in assuming jurisdiction in the Jennings case. Unfortunately, the evidence is all too clear that the issue raised by the publishers over the Jennings case (which was reported in full in The New Republic of January 9) is merely a cloak for their antagonism toward the American Newspaper Guild and for their efforts to prevent the Guild's becoming a strong union. This is readily apparent from an examination of the issue itself. The Labor Board has ruled that Congress gave it authority to hear disputes in any codified industry; under that authority it heard the Jennings case, found that he had lost his job because of Guild activity and ordered his reinstatement. The Code Authority of the publishing business declares that this action of the board was a violation of the Newspaper Code, that it was "invalid and illegal" because (according to the Code Authority) the Newspaper Industrial Board, set up under the Code, is supposed to have "exclusive and final" jurisdiction over all disputes in the newspaper industry. Obviously, this issue does not involve the freedom of the press; it involves nothing more than a difference of legal opinion between the Labor Board and the publishers as to its authority and as to the meaning of the Newspaper Code. This difference could be settled easily by an appeal to the courts. It is significant, we believe, that the publishers have refused an offer made by Mr. Morris Ernst, counsel for the Guild, to take this issue into the Circuit Court of Appeals

THAT the newspaper publishers are unwilling to risk proper adjudication of their dispute with the Guild can hardly be explained on the basis that they are afraid the Labor Board jeopardizes a free press. The real reason apparently is that they do not want Guild cases heard before an impartial agency, such as the National Labor Relations Board, where the Guild might win repeated victories. They know that their own agency, the Newspaper Industrial Board, is safe from the publishers' point of view. This board, composed of four publishers and four labor representatives, is by its nature incapable of reaching decisions. Last week in New York City, this board considered two Guild cases and deadlocked on both. It considered the Jennings case, which had been referred to it for its recommendation by the N.R.A., but it was unable to agree on any recommendation. By its own action in these cases, the board has clearly demonstrated that it is incapable of giving newspaper workers either a fair hearing or a prompt adjudication of their grievances. It is a mechanism for tying labor's hands—which may explain why the publishers are so insistent on having all disputes heard exclusively by this board without the right of appeal to an impartial board. Meanwhile, in Washington last week at the N.R.A. hearings on minimum wages for newspaper workers, it developed that the publishers are not inclined to make any great contribution toward recovery. It was pointed out that their proposal of minimum wages of $12 to $25, depending on the size of cities, would mean, on the basis of their own survey of wages paid on 771 newspapers, an increase in payrolls of only $1.40 per week per paper. Of 17,770 newspaper workers covered by the publishers' survey, only seven men were receiving less than the minimum of $12, while newspapers in cities of 750,000 population would be called upon by the $25 minimum to contribute only seventy-five cents per week per paper—a total burden of $1,820 annually for all these newspapers. These proposed increases should be considered in the light of the fact that the newspaper publishing business was one of the most prosperous in 1933 and 1934. Undoubtedly, if the N.R.A. declares that these minimum wages are inadequate and endorses the Guild's proposals of minimums of $25 to $45 per week, the publishers may be expected to retort that such a recommendation represents another threat to the free press.

ONE of the most useful by-products of the administration's activities has been the encouragement of the formation of state planning agencies, which are concerned chiefly with programs for land use, water resources and the like. The report of the New York State Planning Board, recently submitted, is typical, and follows the main lines laid out several years ago by the preliminary report on a state plan drawn up by Governor Smith's commission on hous-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

marginal lands into the public domain and using them for forestry, upland watersheds and erosion prevention. It shows the possibility of proper apportionment of city water supplies, development of water power, more efficient planning of farm-service roads and farm electric lines by concentrating cultivation on the more fertile areas, protection of wild life and extension of hunting, fishing and other recreational facilities in the non-cultivated areas. A central issue in all such programs is, of course, how the marginal lands shall be acquired. Since many square miles of such land are now tax delinquent, the best course would appear to be for the state to take over the land for non-payment of taxes. The federal government, in its own land-retirement program, could purchase the land at a minimum expense and help out the shaky state finances simply by buying it from the states at the value of the back taxes. But neither the government nor many of the states seem able to proceed far along this line because of tax moratoria and the pressure of mortgage interests. Of course it would be cruel to take farm homes away from those who have no other place to live, but much of the land in question has already been abandoned and a great deal of it is mere stumpage.

Why Not Abolish Child Labor?

THE Child Labor Amendment has again been endorsed by President Roosevelt. In a letter to Courtenay Dinwiddie, general secretary of the National Child Labor Committee, the President points out the disappearance of child labor under the N.R.A. codes and expresses the hope that these gains may be extended by "the obvious method," of ratification of the Amendment.

It is an interesting coincidence that in the past year the opponents of the Child Labor Amendment have been winning their fight against it, while at the same time child labor itself has been slowly disappearing. There are only thirteen codes drawn up under the N.I.R.A. that do not contain some provision against the exploitation of children. The provisions from code to code vary between excellent and unsatisfactory, but taken together they have removed at least 100,000 children from industry and barred 50,000 more from dangerous occupations. As many as 20,000 have been removed from textile manufacturing alone, 28,000 from retail stores, 8,000 from hotels and restaurants, perhaps 40,000 from general manufacturing of all kinds. More than 400 codes forbid the employment of persons under sixteen and in addition forbid the employment of persons under eighteen in dangerous tasks. Some codes forbid all employment under eighteen.

Even among the thirteen codes that do not prohibit the employment of boys and girls under sixteen, all but one, the newspaper code, either provide some safeguards or have a valid reason for permitting ing and theatre codes, for example, could not reasonably forbid the legitmate use of child actors. The codes covering various retail trades permit the employment of children between the ages of fourteen and sixteen for three hours a day outside of school hours.

But there are still plenty of black spots. Seventy-eight codes have no provision against the use of persons under eighteen in dangerous work, and, unfortunately, among these codes are those covering iron and steel where the hazards are large. The provisions in many codes covering industrial home-work are extremely unsatisfactory, but this is not strictly a child-labor problem. It is a result of the general inadequacy of attempts so far made to establish safeguards of any kind in this type of work. The worst field, of course, is the newspaper industry; for not only are the code provisions covering child labor anything but satisfactory, but the peculiar provisions of this code make it apparently impossible of amendment.

The original version of the Newspaper Code would have allowed the employment in selling and delivering papers of both boys and girls, of any age, at any hour, day or night, except school hours. After strenuous resistance by the publishers this was slightly modified last February, but only to the extent of forbidding children under sixteen to sell papers at night. Since most night work is that of delivering the papers, while the selling is done largely by day, this amendment was more in the nature of a joke than a reality. In June new hearings were held on a code amendment that would have forbidden the employment of girls under eighteen and boys under fourteen (except boys of twelve already employed) and would have prevented the use of boys under sixteen on either selling or delivery routes at night. Opposition of the publishers has so far blocked action on these.

But there are many industries operating without codes at all, and among them are several important employers of children. There is no code for the anthracite-coal mines, where child labor is widespread; none for the telegraph companies, which employ thousands of boys; none for industrialized agriculture, none for domestic servants. Child-labor protection is, therefore, far from complete; nor is the gain so far made under the N.R.A. necessarily permanent. There is nothing in the law or the codes that may not melt away under the warmth of a rising industrial activity.

The complete step in dealing with child labor remains, therefore, the Constitutional Amendment, and to all appearances it will either be ratified this winter or rejected for good. During 1933, fourteen states added their ratifications to the six made earlier. Only sixteen states are now needed, but of the ten states that considered the Amendment during 1934, not one ratified it. This winter the Amendment comes before the legislatures in twenty-four states, but if it is not finally ratified now, it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most states meet again and can reconsider. By that time the tide of opposition may be stronger and defeatism and lethargy may have cowed the proponents.

The gains in reducing child labor under the N.R.A. are, in a measure, a natural introduction to the Amendment. Large sections of industry are already getting accustomed to doing without child employees; such slight business derangements as might follow the ratification of the Amendment are already being minimized. The opposition, to be sure, is strong, but it is not irresistible. The hostility of the Catholic Church is hampered by the strong pro-Amendment position of many devout Catholics. The general "anti-regimentation" cry of business has sunk to a whisper since the last election. The few outstanding liberals who have taken a hostile attitude are beginning to look lonely. The tide is setting against child labor; this is the psychological moment for ratification.

Unshackling the Tax Power

STEP BY step in recent years the Supreme Court has been erecting a formidable constitutional bulwark for a thoroughgoing program of social reform through taxation, when and if such a program is ever enacted. The latest addition to this structure passed almost unnoticed the other day amid the hullabaloo over the gold-clause cases. By a vote of five to four the Court sustained the drastic provisions of the West Virginia chain-stores tax, under which five oil companies doing only about 4 percent of the chain-store business in the state were required to pay 83.5 percent of the total chain-store taxes, or $476,171.

The decision marks a distinct advance over the decisions in the two previous cases dealing with similar, but not identical, statutes of Indiana and Florida. In the first of these, it will be remembered, a divided court upheld the general principle of taxes that fall more heavily on stores operated in chains and that are graduated according to the size of the chain. In the second, while reaffirming that same general principle, the Court outlawed a special feature that also graduated the tax according to the number of counties in which the chain operated. Now—returning to the main line of the Indiana decision—the Court not only repulses a disingenuous effort to distinguish filling stations from general-commodity chains, but it refuses to concern itself with the scale of graduation or the burden that scale imposes. It says in effect that the state, if it chooses, may tax the chains out of existence.

The attack upon the constitutionality of the statute, which had prevailed in the lower court, was leveled by the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey. The company pointed to the precipitous scale of graduation, mounting by intermediate steps from $2 a year for single stores to $250 for stores in excess of seventy-five. A few general-commodity chains fell within the higher brackets, but not many; the largest was the A. & P. with 198 stores. By contrast the Standard Oil was taxable for 1,003 establishments, and alone paid 42 percent of the taxes collected under the act. Not only this, but it was shown that the tax fell more heavily upon filling stations in proportion to earnings than upon other "stores," since such stations do a much smaller gross business.

To all this the Court's answer was uncompromising. "When the power to tax exists, the extent of the burden is a matter for the discretion of the lawmakers." The state may not only tax large chains more heavily than small ones, "but it may make the tax so heavy as to discourage multiplication of the units to an extent deemed inordinate, and by the incidence of the burden develop other forms of industry. . . . 'Even if the tax should destroy a business, it would not be made invalid or require compensation on that ground alone.' "

Singly the decision would have been remarkable only if it had gone the other way. Nor is it mainly important as clearing the way beyond question for the isolated and perhaps dubious palliative of chain-store taxation. Its significance, taken together with numerous other cases, lies rather in its application to measures not yet adopted, in its revelation of powers of taxation, both state and federal, not yet explored. Whenever a serious effort is made in this country to appraise the social utility of large-scale versus small-scale enterprise in the different fields of industry, the taxing power will stand ready to hand to give effect to the findings. Meanwhile it is not the Court and the Constitution but Congress and the President who are responsible for further toleration of fantastic inequalities in personal incomes and estates, for failure to exploit the possibilities by taxation of "weeding out the overprivileged" and "lifting up the underprivileged."

A further observation may be ventured, for which again this single decision furnishes only the text and not the supporting data. A historic function of the Constitution and the Court during the last half-century has been as a prop to the dominant system of free corporate enterprise. As that system itself decays, so the prop is failing. Experience on a dozen fronts has demonstrated the impossibility of molding constitutional doctrine to serve any other purpose than the auxiliary one of cementing control dependent primarily on voluntary acceptance in the legislatures and among the people. As the straitjacket for the status quo, which some persons have conceived it to be, the Constitution has always had fatal weaknesses. Professor Corwin discusses one of them illuminatingly in his recent book, "The Twilight of the Supreme Court"—the apparently illimitable "spending power" of Congress. Another is illustrated by this case, and there are many more. At its worst, the role of constitutional law in a transitional period will be to restrict the freedom of legislative choice among methods, not to foreclose ultimate ends. A [illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sensitive to the necessities of government in the majority, such a restriction may well operate to embarrass the worse rather than the better choice, to strike down nothing much more serious than slipshod draftsmanship of the sort disclosed in the recent oil case. Such a development need be regarded as the twilight neither of the Supreme Court nor of the Constitution. It would mark simply the emergence to renewed dominance of a tradition not less ancient than any other and always more honorable.

Labor's Best Tool

MUCH has been said about the failures of the federal government in holding the way open for the unions, less about the capacity of the unions to proceed along the ways that are open, or to force a way for themselves. Yet the latter is, in the end, by far the more important issue. Legislation can do no more than assure that labor has legal rights, if indeed it can do that. Section 7a was important chiefly in arousing hope and confidence; the fulfilment of that hope rests fully as much upon the competence of organized labor as upon the attitude of public officials and employers.

The sooner those responsible for union organization in the United States wake up to these facts, the sooner they will begin to provide a more solid basis for a revivified labor movement than a few laws passed by Congress or the appointment of friendly governmental agents. Many unions and their leaders long ago came to this conclusion, and went on to the second state, of active organization, with its usual accompaniment of agitation and collective action. The gaining and keeping of members, and the representation of their interest before employers and boards is, of course, the main business of active union workers. But even this second stage, however successful it may be temporarily, is only half the battle. Seasoned and permanent unions require seasoned and enthusiastic members, led by able officials. The heart of the labor movement consists of a body of faith, of knowledge and of competence that must be learned and must be constantly refreshed. While the natural impulses of unorganized workers may be sufficient to draw them into unions under favorable conditions, they are no more than raw recruits until the unions have educated them. Education for leaders and organizers is also just as necessary if the movement is to take proper advantage of the opportunities at hand.

The point of all this is that no activity of the trade-union movement is more important, particularly at this juncture, than labor education. Labor education sometimes has a dull or irrelevant sound, due to the fact that it is occasionally misconceived as handing down dead knowledge from above, or as a collection of frills having only the vaguest connection with the business of the labor movement, such as dancing or pageantry. True labor education, however, has always gone on in vital organizations, even before the phrase was ever invented, through eager discussion of social or political theories, of the future of society, of the proper form and function of unions. And organized education has long since domesticated itself and has been adapted to the needs of the unions in such progressive bodies, for instance, as the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, which has been the pioneer of the movement in this country. The large body of competence that such organizations have developed is chiefly responsible for the fact that they have been able to take exceptional advantage of the opportunities offered by new legislation.

Nowadays, with the rapid growth of membership, labor education even of the most elementary character is more necessary than ever. The raw recruits frequently do not know how to conduct a meeting, or how to draw up demands or begin to bargain. They are ignorant of the history of their union and of the movement as a whole, and their knowledge of the theories behind the movement is so elementary that they may be a prey to propaganda of employers or even of fascistic groups. Such pamphlets as have recently been issued by the educational department of the I.L.G.W.U.—"Introducing Your Union," "You and Your Union," "How to Conduct a Union Meeting" and "Structure and Functioning of the I.L.G.W.U."—are models of the way to meet such needs.

Desirable as is education from the point of view of union activity, it is even more desirable if organized labor is to contribute what is expected of it toward the building of a better world. Everyone who has hopes of such a world is dependent on the intelligence and conviction of the labor movement. Officials buried in the details of the day's work, or flushed with the success of recent growth, or harried by failure and disappointment, should take thought that there can be no labor movement worthy of the name without those cultural activities that give solidarity and direction to the organized masses. Education, both of the rank and file and of emergent leadership, is the only means to this end.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1935, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN W. P. MANGOLD
LEWIS MUMFORD GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Facts About Faces: III. *Secretary Wallace*

Large cast-iron head with swinging dark gray hair, shaggy but well curried. Big flat forehead like a table, displaying three horizontal lines and two deep uprights, carved clean as by a penknife. Eyebrows spread impressively, imparting a Winged-Victory lunge to nose. Eyes deep-set, steady, each like a vigorously advancing tugboat followed by a widely swirling wake of wrinkles. Mouth smiling, fixed intently, shy, restrained. Looks as if he were going somewhere on a bus, possibly to the fair, self-conscious, all dressed up and scrubbed, determined to behave [illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Future in India

FIVE YEARS ago, on the eve of Christmas, 1929, through Lord Irwin as its spokesman, the British government reaffirmed the promise that India should evolve towards the goal of dominion status; as the instrument of this development it offered a Round Table Conference. The name implied equality between the two sides in the discussion, and that word was repeatedly used, though it was always understood that the formal and final responsibility, in passing the act that would give a new constitution to India, remained with the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

What Mr. Macdonald and Lord Irwin really intended when they held out this prospect of equality in negotiation is of interest rather to the biographer than to the historian. On a realistic view there is and can be no equality in power between these two; behind the courtesies of the Round Table the involuntary debtor still confronted the creditor, and the debtor was disarmed, while the creditor dominated the Peninsula that is his field of investment with a supreme navy, an adequate army and a sufficiency of bombing airplanes. The Indian delegates were, moreover, politically in a position of extreme weakness. They were all of them the nominees of the British government and not of their own people, and after Mr. Gandhi had been transferred from the Round Table to the prison of Poona, only the Moslem minority had behind it any solid body of organized opinion. The British delegates were on their side plenipotentiaries, who could speak for organized parties and an omnipotent ministry in full control of an elected Parliament.

The last phase is now in sight. The British Parliament has just given its general approval to a detailed sketch of a Constitution, embodied in an elaborate, reasoned report, and will in the course of the coming year translate these recommendations, probably without substantial amendment, into an act. In the meanwhile, a general election held throughout the Peninsula, with the proposed Constitution as the sole issue, has returned a new Legislative Assembly—to use the polite official name for this almost impotent consultative body. The electorate, which includes only three percent of the population of British India, is a select panel drawn from the middle and upper classes. Judged by this relatively conservative electorate, the Constitution has been emphatically rejected. If one omits the nominated and official members and the Europeans, the Congress Party holds forty-four seats, and to the Left of it are the Hindu Extremists known as Nationalists with nine seats, while two Moslems and two Sikhs hold "Congress" opinions. Moslems will take a more moderate view, but it is doubtful if even they will accept the Constitution without heavy reservations. Finally, there are eleven members representing, in separate constituencies, small numbers of persons—Chambers of Commerce, landlords, Indian Christians, Eurasians—of whom most but probably not quite all will vote, as usual, in the official phalanx. There are, therefore, in this highly conservative elected body, at least fifty-seven voices against the Constitution, and barely forty who may register a qualified acceptance. No one with any recent knowledge of India would doubt that an election conducted on a genuinely democratic basis would have resulted in a still more emphatic rejection.

We may, then, dismiss from our memories all the elaborate camouflage devised to convey the impression that this Constitution was freely negotiated between equals. Selected Indians were indeed consulted, but only the minorities have left their mark upon the final result. Like every other system under which India has been governed, from the days of the Company onwards, this Constitution reflects the will of the armed overlord from beyond the seas. It is an imposed settlement, and if the hostile majority consents in any sense to work it, it will do so in a spirit of fundamental opposition.

By the other test that the Viceroy's declaration invited, this Constitution fares no better. Few Indians expected or would have insisted that an unqualified dominion constitution should be granted here and now. For some period of transition, and for some qualifications and safeguards, most were prepared. What they did expect was the concession in principle of this dominion status, and the planning of the steps by which, over a series of years, without further bargaining or the clash of wills, it should be reached. Such a formula was to my knowledge under consideration at an early stage, and would have satisfied even Mr. Gandhi. It vanished from the discussions as the imperial partner gradually hardened his heart. In the final report there is no reaffirmation of the promise of dominion status, nor does this goal appear to influence in any perceptible way the orientation of the road.

Indeed, to speak of a road is misleading. For this is a static Constitution. It includes no machinery for its amendment or development. Not even in minor details have Indians the power to change it. There is, indeed, a specific reminder that if the new Legislatures should, after a lapse of years, desire an alteration of the franchise or of the provisions for the creation of upper chambers of the Legislatures, they may by petition ask the British Parliament to give effect to their wishes. This,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a limiting provision. It means and is intended to mean that, save in these two matters, any application for the amendment of this Constitution will be fruitless. The ruling class of this island conceives itself as having made, for any length of time that need concern the present generation, its final concession to India. This it is, more than all the mountainous accumulation of safeguards, this more even than the forbidding conservative structure of this Constitution, that damns it in the eyes of Indians. It buries hope out of sight. A wise and imaginative statesmanship would have flouted it.

What, then, is the value of these concessions, viewed as a system of government that must suffice for our lifetime? Was nothing really won by those two prolonged periods of civil disobedience, by the sufferings of those patient crowds that endured the staves of the police, by the hundred thousand volunteers who courted imprisonment, by the passive rebellion of whole provinces, which starved the revenues and boycotted the Empire's wares? More, I think, would have been won by this demonstration of India's will to be free, if the effort had not been repeated a second time. Mr. Gandhi overstrained the endurance of this nation, and demonstrated at the end what was doubtful in the first year—the efficacy of ruthless coercion.

Two things, however, India has gained—if the second of them be a gain. The first of these two was non-contentious, and therefore excited little interest. Provincial autonomy awaited India as the one inevitable advance. The Simon Report recommended it, though it went no further, and so much all but the most incorrigible of the Die-Hards were ready to concede. The word "provincial" is misleading. Gauged by their population, some of these "provinces" would rank in Europe as Great Powers. Within their scope of legislation fall nearly all the chief concerns of an Indian's daily life—education, the social services, the police, agriculture, irrigation and public works, labor legislation and measures for the regulation of industry. The main concerns of the federal administration affect the average peasant less closely—foreign policy, defense, customs and railway communications. It looks at a first glance as if this meant that in all that touches him nearly, the average man, who in India is the villager, would be master in his own house. A closer analysis disposes of this flattering prospect.

The administration is still effectively sovereign, because it controls the main sources of revenue. It is also undeniable that this Constitution, though it marks a very cautious advance towards democracy, is still, even in the provinces, overwhelmingly conservative. It enfranchises only 14 percent of the male population and a negligible fraction of the women. The poorer masses of tenants, the smaller peasants and the laborers will be voteless. It is true that special representation is provided for the urban factory workers and for the untouchables, but their representatives will be outvoted several times over by the additional representation assigned to property—landlords, chambers of commerce, universities and Europeans. As if this were not enough, an upper chamber, based on a high property franchise, is provided in the more important provinces and armed with a veto. The "forgotten man" can indeed raise his voice in impotent protest, but property will be securely entrenched in power. Worse still, given the division of the electorate into closed religious compartments, it is barely possible that any parties based on the general interests of the masses should be formed.

This said, it remains to add that "responsible" self-government will work under an English Governor armed with the most formidable powers. He will preside over the Cabinet meetings of his Indian Ministers; there will be no effective Prime Minister. Charged with many "special responsibilities," this Governor is armed with many "special powers." Not only may he veto any act of the Legislature; he may, if any of his many "responsibilities" so move him, carry legislation by the simple process of dictating its terms to his typist. That he will often need to do this is improbable: it will usually suffice that he should remind his Ministers of the power he holds in reserve. This system will work comfortably in provinces that have a social structure that lends itself easily to the dominance of a privileged propertied class. It will work smoothly in the Punjab, which has a powerful landlord class, and rather less smoothly in Madras. In turbulent Bengal it will work painfully, if at all. But how many provinces will fall into the first, and how many into the second category, only a rash prophet would dare to predict.

The second gain—if gain it be—lends itself to rhetoric. This federal Constitution promises to the whole Peninsula a unity that it has enjoyed in the past only for the briefest space of time in the most splendid periods of its long history. To bring together the eleven British provinces with the hundreds of scattered Indian States, some of them great kingdoms and others mere parishes, ought to shine out as a superb achievement of statesmanship. At last, focused in Delhi, an Indian nation will exist. with a ministry of Indians at its head, responsible to a representative Assembly. All this is true, and on the whole Liberal and Labor opinion in England, while fully aware of the defects of this federal scheme, is unwilling to upset it and trusts to time to remove its deformities.

Though I am nearly alone in this opinion, I cannot take this cheerful view of the federal Constitution. In the first place, I am far from being sure that it will ever come into being, even after the lapse of several years: several conditions, not all of them easy, have first to be satisfied. In the second place, I think this federal Constitution so unsatisfactory from the standpoint of Indian nationality, and so likely to produce an impotent and sterile administration, uncreative and reactionary in its tendencies, that I doubt whether it will embody

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

India in a happy or inspiring incarnation. In that event, such of the provinces as contrive to work their autonomous constitutions smoothly will evolve a local patriotism that may actually weaken the sense of nationality. In particular it is possible that the Mohammedan region in the Northwest may tend to ignore the rest of India.

I will not repeat in detail the usual criticisms that come from Indians, sound though most of them are. The safeguards are so exaggerated that they leave nothing of responsibility save an irritating figment. If you are policed by a foreign army which you must pay but cannot control; if the Viceroy may send native Indian troops to fight the battles of the Empire outside the Peninsula without the consent of his Indian Ministers; if the Finance Minister and the Assembly can control only 20 percent of the expenditure of the Federation, it is a bad joke to talk of responsible self-government. The Viceroy's powers of veto are much too wide, and they are manifestly designed in the main to protect British economic interests. He has a veto on tariffs which in his view discriminate unfairly against British trade. He may interfere if the Finance Minister should do anything likely in his view to "prejudice India's credit in the money-markets of the world." Since India borrows only in the City of London, this is to make the views of British investors the test of Indian policy.

The main reason, however, for thinking this Constitution a false start is that it entrenches property in a position from which nothing short of a social revolution could dislodge it. One-third of the Assembly will consist of nominated representatives of the Princes. With three or four shining exceptions they are old-world autocrats: they are subject to pressure by the viceregal apparatus: but, so far as they count as an independent force, they are the leaders of the landlord class and stand for property in its most oppressive and least creative form. When one adds that the Mahommedans, also in the main a conservative force under the leadership of a wealthy and obscurantist group, constitute another third, it is obvious that the representatives of the Hindu masses could exert little influence even if they were chosen by a popular vote. But they themselves will be indirectly elected, and as if this were not enough, two Chambers are provided to neutralize each other.

This Assembly, in so far as it can make itself felt, will govern India in the interests of property. From it no creative force can emerge to sweep away the obstacles that keep the Indian village ignorant, half-starved and incapable of raising its pitiable standard of life. This Constitution holds no promise of any planned reconstruction of the social and economic basis of this Peninsula. It will remain, what it is today, a vast rural slum, to which science offers its aid in vain.

London. H. N. BRAILSFORD.

The Consumer Gets a Break

THE CHAIN stores have now accepted at least the principle of government standards of quality for canned goods. Within a short time it is possible that you will see on the labels of all canned tomatoes, corn, peas, snap beans and grapefruit sold in chain stores the legends: "Grade A: Fancy," "Grade B: Choice," or "Grade C: Standard." For the first time, the consumer may have some chance of knowing what he or she is getting.

This voluntary acceptance by the chain stores of the idea of grading according to quality has greatly encouraged the consumers' representatives in the Roosevelt administration. For nearly a year, these consumers' representatives have been engaged in a rough-and-tumble struggle over grading with the canning industry as a whole. They now have hopes that they can force the canners to yield. After that, why should not makers of clothing, furniture, kitchen utensils, electrical appliances—in short, all producers of consumers' goods—be compelled to accept quality standards?

Spokesmen for the National Canners' Association have repeatedly denounced quality grading as [illegible] property and the Constitution. The fact is that quality grading is nothing new or strange. In the grocery trade, for example, "strictly fresh" eggs and "Grade A" milk are familiar quality grades that have existed for years. All that the consumers' representatives in the administration seek to do is to set up similar quality grades for canned goods and—this is what the canners hate—see to it that these grades are enforced by law.

This struggle between the administration and the canners over quality grading goes back to last year's Copeland Pure Food and Drug Bill. During the hearings before Congress on the Copeland bill, lobbyists for the canners first attempted to prove that grading was impracticable, that degrees of goodness couldn't be assigned to such intangibles as taste and aroma, that one can of tomatoes might seem perfection to one man and poison to another.

The canners' spokesmen were promptly asked how this could be reconciled with the fact that jobbers and wholesalers never had any difficulty in determining the quality grades of canned goods. A jobber, buying a consignment of fancy canned corn, for example, learns without the least difficulty

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whether the corn is, in truth, fancy. In advancing a warehouse loan on canned peas, a bank is always able to determine what is the quality grade of the goods on which the loan is to be based. All that the canning section of the Copeland bill proposed to do, it was pointed out, was to make this same information available to the consumer.

After the Copeland bill was finally killed late last spring, the struggle over grading shifted to the N.R.A., before which the Canning Code had been pending for many months. Mr. Roosevelt summoned the canners' spokesmen to the White House, and told them that the code must be signed, and must contain provisions for grading. The canners argued, protested, begged for further discussion. To this Mr. Roosevelt eventually agreed, and a joint N.R.A. committee of canners and government officials was set up to report on the whole question.

When the committee met last summer, the delegates of the canners advanced the plea that grading would injure brand names. However, in the meantime the Consumers' Advisory Board had resorted to the very sensible expedient of visiting neighborhood grocery stores around Washington, buying at random a few cans of recognized brand names and taking the cans off to be analyzed. The results of their investigation now threw a sharp light on what seems to be the real reason for the canners' opposition.

For some time, Armin W. Riley, deputy N.R.A. administrator and the man directly in charge of negotiations with the canners, kept two cans of tomatoes, furnished him by the Consumers' Advisory Board, on his desk to show visitors. Both cans were processed by the same manufacturer, bore the same sky-blue label, were bought from the same retail grocer and cost the same amount of money. On one can—plain enough if you knew where to look—you could make out the producer's mark indicating that the can was of first quality. On the other can was the producer's mark indicating second quality. Both cans, remember, cost exactly the same. Obviously the housewife who bought the second can was going to be cheated.

The Consumers' Advisory Board has not had the funds or the investigators to make a complete survey of the canning industry. But it has collected enough evidence to show that the practice of sneaking second-quality canned goods into first-quality cans—at first-quality prices—is not uncommon. It has found out that some of the canners guilty of this practice are those owning brand names on which "millions of dollars in advertising" have been spent —advertising, it now appears, for the purpose of fooling and robbing the consumer.

Last summer, a very successful, and candid, canner sought to explain the industry to a high N.R.A. official. "Canning isn't like automobiles, where you can produce to definite specifications," he protested. "For example I've just had [illegible] five thousand labels printed up for my best brand of tomatoes. Now suppose that in the districts where I buy my tomatoes, they've had too much rain, or not enough rain, and I can't find twenty-five thousand extra-fancy cans of tomatoes. What would you want me to do, throw my labels away?"

This man is a sort of second-degree crook, or crook without premeditated intent. But the Consumers' Advisory Board asserts it has uncovered instances of out-and-out, first-degree crookedness, instances where jobbers have deliberately switched labels on second-quality canned goods in order to sell them as being of first quality.

When the canners discovered that the Consumers' Advisory Board had in its possession such highly embarrassing evidence, they sought to compromise. At last they were ready to admit that the consumer has a right to know what is inside the can he or she buys. They came forward with a scheme called "descriptive labeling," under which each of a number of characteristics of a canned food is separately graded, but no inclusive grade is given to the contents of the whole can. With canned corn, for example, tenderness is to be graded as: "very tender," or "medium tender," or "firm, not tough," or "not tender." The corn's appearance is to be given as: "to a high degree free from dark kernels cob, husk or silk," or "practically free from dark kernels, cob, husk or silk," or "reasonably free from dark kernels, cob, husk or silk." And so on for a half dozen other qualities.

By a little arithmetic, Mr. Riley found that under "descriptive labeling" one hundred and forty-four combinations, or grades, of corn would be possible. Having a sense of humor, he had one hundred and forty-four labels of "Rosy Brand Corn" printed and bound in a booklet: "Rosy Brand Corn, Not Tender, Reasonably Free from Dark Kernels" and so on, page after page. The booklet is a complete proof of how bewildering and useless "descriptive labeling" would be for the value-hunting housewife. Another booklet, with just three labels: "Rosy Brand Corn" and grades "A," "B" and "C," shows the administration's proposals.

Meantime the Consumers' Advisory Board had sent investigators to Canada, where quality grading of canned goods has been enforced by the Ottawa government for nearly a generation. The investigators reported that leading Canadian canners testified that they were entirely content with quality grading, that they had experienced no difficulties in assigning degrees of goodness to taste and aroma, and that no serious obstacles had ever arisen over enforcement. Moreover, they declared that they had not found grading injurious to brand names or to legitimate advertising. Sales of branded canned goods, and canning advertising, had increased.

Backed by the White House, Mr. Riley has refused to approve "descriptive labeling." On their side, the canners have remained adamant against quality grading. About two months ago, however, Mr. [illegible]

LICENSED TO JINZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pealing directly to John A. Hartford, head of the A. & P. chain stores, to agree to grading. Mr. Hartford hesitated for twenty-four hours, and then wired Mr. Riley that the A. & P. would tentatively accept and bring out six staple products in graded cans as an experiment. Since then, all the principal chain grocery stores have consented to having a grading regulation placed in the code. It should be explained that the chain stores, for the most part, process their own canned goods, and are apart from the main body of the canning industry. It is reported that most canners regard the chain stores as a group of little Benedict Arnolds because they accept grading without protest.

Deserted by the chain stores, the canners are now fighting desperately. Some Washington optimists believe that Mr. Roosevelt, angered by their patent tactics of delay, is preparing to deliver an ultimatum informing the canners that they must agree to incorporate quality grading in their N.R.A. Code, or else have a code containing quality grading imposed on them.

If the canners are finally compelled to surrender, it will be the biggest victory the consumer has won in a long time. Consumers will no longer have to buy blindfolded, and they will be able to spend their money for food values instead of for beautiful labels and meaningless advertising. Canned goods ought to become both cheaper and better. But the real importance of the victory would be as a precedent. Until quality classifications have been decreed for all consumers' industries, and some such agency as the Federal Bureau of Standards empowered to see that they are lived up to, the consumer will continue to be largely defenseless.

Washington. JONATHAN MITCHELL.

Hot Oil

WHEN THE Supreme Court declared unconstitutional the oil provisions of the N.I.R.A. it added one more item of confusion to a situation already sufficiently bedeviled. Regulation—never too good at best—disappears until Congress can make another try at controlling this vital industry.

Expert testimony before a special committee of the House of Representatives indicates that the United States oil reserve is being used up three times as rapidly as that of the remainder of the world and that if the 1933 rate of production were maintained the reserve from known sources would be depleted within fifteen years. The rate of production in the first seven months of 1934 was two and one-half times the rate of discovery of new sources.

During the last five years, the rush to get oil out of the ground as quickly as possible has led to the drilling of 14,000 wells in East Texas; a Bureau of Mines engineer has declared that 1,000 wells probably would have produced as much oil. Equally wasteful are methods prevailing in the Texas Panhandle, where the natural gas allowed to blow into the air from dry wells is estimated at one billion cubic feet a day. Vast additional amounts are also being squandered here in other ways. Gas wasted in the Panhandle exceeds the total output of natural gas in any state except Texas.

Hot oil, produced and sold in violation of the now unconstitutional quota regulations, was responsible for much of the trouble. Exact figures are unavailable, since the flow was secret and varied greatly from week to week. The Railroad Commission of Texas, charged with the enforcement of [illegible] of hot oil were being run daily to East Texas refinery stills. Federal oil officials estimated this illegal flow at 90,000 barrels a day, while private estimates ranged from 87,000 to 150,000 barrels. For the whole country, Bureau of Mines figures showed an average daily production of 149,000 barrels for the first quarter of 1934.

To be told that only forty barrels of oil may be taken daily from a well capable of producing possibly as much as 15,000 barrels goes against the grain of the adventurers and speculators who own many of the wells. Some of these owners have used dummy wells to multiply their allowance. Others have sent oil through secret pipes to trucks that were loaded by starlight, or to fly-by-night refineries. These mushroom refineries have shipped out trainload after trainload of untreated oil labeled as gasoline.

Spokesmen for the petroleum industry, more interested in profits than in conservation, were divided on methods of dealing with hot oil. Executives of the major companies realized, of course, that bootleg oil threatened their own interests, but many of the oil men balked at proposals to strengthen federal control. The chairman of the National Petroleum Council went so far as to demand that President Roosevelt remove Harold L. Ickes from his post as administrator of the petroleum industry.

Others, however, reached the conclusion that the only salvation for the twelve-billion-dollar industry lay in stricter regimentation by the federal government. Complete national control was advocated by Frank Phillips, president of the Phillips Petroleum Company. Asserting that some of the large oil companies were giving away their gasoline, he said [illegible] in with executives of the oil indus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

try for ten years he was convinced that "we are wholly incompetent to solve our own problems by voluntary agreements under existing agencies." Price cutting, chiseling and unfair trade practices, he added, "are more prevalent today than at any time during my thirty years in this business. Agreements mean nothing. Some of those who are most active in promoting these agreements are violators. As I told my own directors the other day, 'We won't be able to look our grandchildren in the face if they ask us how we conducted our business during these times.' "

Since 1926, when severe competition, the discovery of new oil fields and refinements in technology began causing heavy overproduction and consequent price reductions, control of production has been sought by many means, all without lasting success. Long before this, almost since the beginning of the American oil industry, associations of producers and refiners had tried to restrict the flow of oil in the interest of higher prices, but these early attempts at regimentation had all failed. State laws to restrict production have proved similarly ineffectual. Eighteen states have passed oil and gas conservation laws of one type or another, but overproduction has continued. Interstate compacts, advocated by many who dislike federal control, have also been tried to a limited extent, but in vain. The November resolution of the directors of the American Petroleum Institute in favor of this method finds little support in experience.

By the middle of 1931, there was in operation an interstate proration plan, under which each major area was assigned an "allowable," indicating the number of barrels it might permissibly produce in a given period. Within each area, a local body prorated production among various pools and even down to individual wells. However, so many producers refused to observe these allotments and so many rushed production frantically to get as much oil out of the ground as possible before effective enforcement might be imposed that the price of crude oil touched a low of ten cents a barrel in East Texas. The Governors of Oklahoma and Texas then resorted to martial law to shut down the wells. The effect of this strong-arm method did not last long. When President Roosevelt came into office, petroleum producers were resigned to outright federal control, though some of the independents still hoped for relief by means of a tariff embargo on oil imports.

The code of fair competition for the petroleum industry signed by the President in August, 1933, sought to establish a self-governing industry under federal supervision. It imposed national control over production, refining and marketing, with authority lodged in the code administrator and in a planning and coördination committee representing the industry. Hopes engendered by the code, plus an increased demand for oil products, brought a quick rise in prices and a sudden prosperity for producers. Following three lean years in which producers claimed that their costs exceeded selling prices of crude oil, the final quarter of 1933 saw nearly all producers operating at a profit.

General oil prosperity continued well through 1934, but independent producers who wanted to take advantage of higher prices without complying with code regulations or proration allowables discovered that hot oil could be produced with impunity, with the result that oil production during the first year of the code's operation was greater than in the previous twelve months. As a result, sporadic oil and gasoline price wars have broken out. The larger companies, especially those that have to buy much of their crude oil, became impatient over the continuance of the hot-oil nuisance and threatened to use price slashes to make hot oil unprofitable, even though such action might wreck the whole machinery of control.

Early in 1934, when serious flaws in the enforcement of the Petroleum Code became apparent, Ickes sought enactment of a federal law to strengthen the government's control of oil production. Under the authority of Congress to regulate interstate shipments, this bill provided for control of output by fixing quotas that might move in interstate commerce. It would have given the Secretary of the Interior authority to fix such quotas for states, pools, areas, and even for individual wells, in order to bring production into balance with consumption. Introduced by Senator Thomas and Representative Disney, and strongly supported by President Roosevelt, the bill appeared at first to have a good prospect of enactment. It was favored by heads of some of the oil companies but failed, finally, to pass.

Since the adjournment of the last Congress, the need for more effective control of oil production in the interest of conservation has by no means diminished. The recent Supreme Court decision makes it more urgent than ever. In Texas, whose oil output equals the combined production of the next greatest oil-producing states, Oklahoma and California, the Legislature passed four new regulatory laws in 1934 without stemming the flow of hot oil. In the East Texas field, where bootleg oil was estimated recently at 20 percent of the total output, runners are reported to be preparing for increased activity in the spring in case Congress takes no drastic action against them.

In the Southwest, where producers of hot oil wield political power and where thousands of voters own oil royalties, anything like the Ickes measure will be fought by the new Governors of Texas and Oklahoma and by the Railroad Commission of Texas, an elective body. Moreover, the new state platform of Texas Democrats contains a sweeping declaration against federal control of unit operations. Everyone, of course, will give lip service to conservation—but only so long as it does not threaten dividends.

Dallas, Texas. WAYNE GARD

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

China Behind the Headlines

EVENTS of the past two months have turned a new page in China's political history. Not since 1930, when the Feng-Yen coalition crumpled under Chiang Kai-shek's hammering and Marshal Chang Hsueh-liang's Manchurian armies stepped into north China, have military realignments of such far-reaching importance occurred. Old landmarks have suddenly crumbled, altering the political map of China in a number of important respects.

As a result of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's sixth major anti-Communist offensive, the Kiangsi-Fukien strongholds of the Chinese Soviets, held intact since 1928, have been evacuated. The center of gravity of the Communist movement has shifted westward to Szechuan Province, where the combined Red forces seem likely to place themselves astride the upper reaches of the Yangtze River in the near future. This daring maneuver, involving a thousand-mile trek across Hunan and Kweichow Provinces, will join the Communist armies for the first time into a single fighting force. With Szechuan Province as its base of operations, the Soviet movement will have gained a new and more commanding position in the Chinese political scene.

Factions within Factions.—This shifting of forces has immediately reacted on the relationships between Nanking and the southeastern provinces of Kwangtung and Kwangsi. The dominant Kuomintang militarist in the southeast is General Chen Chi-tang, who controls the rich province of Kwangtung. Loosely allied with Generals Pai Chung-hsi and Li Tsung-jen of Kwangsi Province, and supported by a coterie of Kuomintang politicos at Canton, he constitutes Chiang Kai-shek's last serious rival within the ranks of the Kuomintang. For over three years he has ruled his satrapy in virtual independence of the Nanking regime. Throughout this period, however, the Soviets in Kiangsi and Fukien Provinces have formed a buffer between Nanking and Canton, more especially since they engaged the bulk of Chiang Kai-shek's armed forces in continuous military operations. Having taken over these buffer areas, Nanking's armies now stand menacingly along the whole length of Kwangtung's northern boundary, and at the same time threaten Kwangsi. Under these circumstances tension between Nanking and Canton grows apace, with the barometer registering heavy weather ahead.

Once again, as on previous occasions, an apparent military success has had the effect of creating fresh difficulties for Chiang Kai-shek. With minor variations, this pattern of events has been repeated in monotonous rhythm since the establishment of the Nanking regime in 1927-28. It is often argued, with some show of plausibility, that Nanking's political control has steadily broadened in scope and effectiveness. The defeat of Feng Yu-hsiang and Yen Hsi-shan in 1930, and the downfall of Chang Hsueh-liang (through the instrumentality of the Japanese) in 1931-33, broke the power of Chiang Kai-shek's most formidable opponents in north China. The consequent gains, however, were neutralized by growing opposition in the south, particularly from the Communist movement. And now, in the wake of another so-called victory, the Communists and Canton still bar the consolidation of the Nanking regime's internal power.

Where the Foreign Devils Bedevil.—This continued instability argues the presence of fundamental causes, operating to negate political progress. Such causes exist. The stranglehold exerted by the foreign powers over China's economic life prevents an independent national development of the country's resources, even on a capitalist basis. The Chinese landlords and bourgeoisie, who constitute the internal economic base of the Nanking regime, are subordinated in essential respects to the all-pervading influence of foreign business enterprise. As a result, Chiang Kai-shek's tenure of power is expressly limited by the continuance of a large measure of external support. His dependence on the Powers, indeed, is greater in degree than his dependence on the local Chinese capitalists, whose interests are continually flouted by Nanking's policies. The Consolidated Tax System, for example, not only bears heavily on the five principal domestic industries: rolled tobacco, matches, cotton yarn, wheat flour and cement, but is so devised as to operate to the flagrant advantage of foreign enterprises, such as the British-American Tobacco Company. These factors lie at the root of Chiang Kai-shek's inability to offer serious opposition to aggressive political encroachments by the foreign powers, notably Japan. They also limit the resistance he can muster against such developments as the United States silver-purchase policy, which is now spreading the blight of a disastrous deflation throughout Chinese economy.

Circumscribed in his external policies, Chiang Kai-shek is no less bedeviled on the internal front. The semi-colonial system of exploitation that is enforced by the foreign powers in coöperation with the Chinese landlord-bourgeoisie, necessarily reduces the Chinese masses to a state of economic serfdom. According to a report issued on December 13 by the Nanking University's College of Agriculture, the average annual income of the Chinese farmer is twenty-six Chinese dollars, or $8.60 in United States currency. The same report estimates

PROTECTED BY U.S. COPYRIGHT LAW
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that over 50 percent of the Chinese peasants are landless tenants, while 9 percent of the landlords own 43 percent of the country's arable land. Here is fuel for a social revolution, and reason enough for the Chinese Communist movement's strength.

Remorseless political and economic pressure from the foreign powers, the revolutionary threat from below and the strife within the Chinese ruling classes (at present Canton versus Nanking) continuously interact to frustrate the most determined efforts to stabilize the Nanking regime.

Hands Across the Yellow Sea.—It is instructive to observe the trend of Nanking's policy during three years of unabashed military aggression by Japan. The Shanghai hostilities of 1931-32, by endangering the interests of the Chinese bourgeoisie, struck at the internal base of Chiang Kai-shek's political power. Following the Shanghai armistice (May 5, 1932), therefore, the Nanking government strictly suppressed all organized public efforts to foster the boycott that was crippling Japan's trade. A year later the north China hostilities were ended by the Tangku truce (May 31, 1933), which demilitarized the Chinese territory bordering on Manchukuo. Two hand-picked agents of Chiang Kai-shek took over the governing powers in north China: General Ho Ying-ching in military affairs, and Huang Fu in political affairs. This Huang Fu regime has come to terms with Japan all along the line—in the restoration of through railway traffic between Peiping and Mukden, in various financial agreements, in the resumption of postal communications with Manchuria, and in the establishment of customs stations at the Great Wall. Nanking's rapprochement with Japan was climaxed by the Chinese tariff revisions of July, 1934, which reduced the duties on a long list of Japanese goods, especially cotton textiles. At the same time the rate on raw cotton was increased, thus doubly penalizing the domestic textile industry. Throughout this period, be it noted, Chiang Kai-shek never once mobilized his military machine against the Japanese.

The successive capitulations to Japan reacted disastrously on the Nanking government's internal position. Popular confidence in the Kuomintang, previously shaken by the strife among its rival militarists, reached a new low ebb. During these years the Communist movement in the south-central provinces grew in size and strength. By 1933 areas totaling one-fifth of China proper, with a population estimated at from fifty to eighty millions, were under Communist control. Local and district Soviets of workers, peasants and soldiers assumed the governing powers in these areas, heading up in the provisional government of the Chinese Soviet Republic, organized at Juichin in southern Kiangsi on November 7, 1931. The landlords and moneylenders were crushed or driven out, a system of land distribution favoring the poorest peasants was introduced, the growing of opium was suppressed, coöperative credit and consumers' societies organized, an aggressive campaign to eradicate illiteracy was inaugurated—in short, the first steps were taken toward the building of a socialist society.

The Open Door in the Air.—Chiang Kai-shek's initial military campaigns against the Chinese Soviets took place at the end of 1930; each year since then his anti-Communist operations have been larger and more continuous. Chiang has also found it necessary to bolster his dictatorship by a secret Blue Jacket society joined with a public New Life Movement, which together constitute an interesting study in a peculiarly truncated form of colonial fascism. Aside from anti-Communist espionage and terrorism, the Blue Jackets have been used by Chiang Kai-shek to strengthen his control over the army, tax revenues and cultural institutions, to break strikes and to crush opposition elements within the Kuomintang. But year after year, despite the mobilization of Nanking troops by the hundreds of thousands, the Soviets battened on a series of striking military victories.

In 1933, on the advice of General von Seeckt, Chiang Kai-shek adopted new tactics in combating the Communist movement. Instead of engaging in offensive expeditions into Communist territory, which were regularly cut to pieces, he sought to organize an ironclad blockade of the central Kiangsi-Fukien Soviets. The blockade was combined with a slow military advance, which consolidated each mile of recaptured territory by road-building and the construction of blockhouses at strategic points. Landing fields for bombing planes purchased chiefly from the United States were laid out in north Kiangsi. Under the direction of Colonel John Jouett and a corps of experienced American military pilots, an aviation school was set up near Hangchow. During the past three years this school has graduated several hundred trained Chinese pilots. Nanking's bombing planes played a decisive role in the drive that forced the evacuation of the Kiangsi-Fukien Soviets in November, 1934.

Red Stars in the West.—Chiang Kai-shek's principal military aim, however, which was to encircle and annihilate the Red armies, was unrealized. Breaking through the blockade, the main Communist forces have fought their way westward across Hunan and Kweichow Provinces. The epic character of the march is enhanced by the fact that the Red Army was undoubtedly accompanied by tens of thousands of civilians. Latest reports have placed this marching host in western Kweichow Province, nearing Szechuan. The Chinese Soviets established in northern Szechuan, which already occupy approximately one-fourth of the province, have recently inflicted a series of defeats on General Liu Hsiang, the provincial governor. The entrance of the main Red armies into Szechuan will throw the balance of power to the Communists. Developments in this sector point to the emergence of a "D..."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chiang Kai-shek has thrown new forces into Szechuan to block the advance of the main Communist army, but his efforts in this region face certain handicaps. The immediate problem at Nanking is the need for clarifying relationships with the southwestern leaders, in view of the newly created military status along the Kwangtung-Kwangsi northern boundaries. A glimpse of the existing tension is afforded by Chiang Kai-shek's severe censure of General Pai Chung-hsi, one of the Kwangsi leaders, for permitting the Red Army to move into Kweichow Province. Even more revealing was the scathing manifesto, signed by all the southeastern military leaders, which was issued in October. It vigorously denounced Chiang Kai-shek's agreements with Japan, particularly the revisions of the Chinese tariff, and pointedly attacked the dictatorial implications of the Blue Jacket organization, which "has used assassination as a means of gaining its political end."

A military struggle between Nanking and the southeast would asssume disastrous proportions. General Chen Chi-tang has assiduously built up an effective fighting force at Canton, including a fleet of planes piloted by Chinese fliers. The planes, like Chiang's, have been bought largely from the United States, and the Cantonese aviators trained by American military instructors. While the stage has been set for conflict, the necessities of the hour counsel compromise. After all, the real danger to Nanking and Canton lies in Szechuan.

T. A. Bisson.

Waking from Snow

Beyond the town's black mouth,
The swarming crossroads, the litter of houses,
Spring closes round the rails.

A thousand gardens white with fruit blossom
Wash up to the carriage window,
A wave, an explosion of life
Bursting under the unexpected sun.

And further South, where mountains assemble,
The bathers floating in their lake-canoes
Lie still, like buds just opened.

Earth, waking from snow
Where the train curls down from the pass,
Has broken the green fall of the slopes
With an upthrust of crocuses, white and purple.

All the abundance of the chestnut trees,
Their piled flowers among the mountains of leaves,
Remind, will stand as a symbol
Of the explosion of men's lives released from snow
The Spring of hand and heart and mind
That still delays.

Washington Notes

New Deal Jitters—Congress Wants Information—Joining Jobs and Men—Again the Kingfish

IT IS possible, though not probable, that before this issue of The New Republic appears—or very soon thereafter—the Supreme Court decision on the gold-clause case will have been rendered. It is not my purpose here to speculate upon what the decision will be, nor to dwell upon the many ingenious suggestions that have been made as to how the administration and Congress might meet the situation in case the government's contention is not sustained. All I desire to do now is to remark that if the decision is postponed much more than a few weeks, some of the leading intellectuals of the Roosevelt regime are going to be unable to stand the strain. Despite the fact that it is considered a foregone conclusion that the Court will decide in their favor, the agitation among them is so intense as to be painful. Inability to sleep and loss of appetite are among the symptoms exhibited by certain members of the so-called inner circle. If the decision is left too long in the air, the mental collapse of at least one of our most conspicuous New Dealers is to be feared. It is impossible for anyone who listens to their apprehensions and views their agitation not to have doubts as to the inherent strength of this administration.

All in all, it looks as if it were going to be a tough winter on the nervous members of the New Deal. After the gold decision has been rendered, there are a whole series to follow. Altogether, there are some twenty-five cases involving the validity of major and minor New Deal laws, upon which the Court will pass in the next four or five months. Even though the prospects are that the bulk of the decisions will be on the New Deal side, a certain percentage of lost cases is conceded and considerable uncertainty as to the future prevails.

Turning from the Court to Congress, there have been indications during the week that the administration will not by any means have the clear sailing for its full program that seemed likely when the session convened. I think Mr. Roosevelt will have his way on the point of being given unrestricted power over the four-billion-dollar appropriation, with no instructions of any sort from Congress, though not without putting on the pressure. Congress will give him the money with no strings attached, but unless all signs fail Congress will make it clear that it wants and expects full, prompt and detailed information as to the projects proposed. I should not be surprised if a joint resolution along these lines were passed. Senator Borah has said he intends to offer one and it is difficult to see how the administration can openly oppose it. It will not, however, like the idea. What the administration really wants from Congress is quick action in making the appropriation and nothing else. That, however, is a little too much to expect and there is a very real intention—in the Senate at least—to insist upon some sort of participation.

The fact appears to be that this administration program has been considered in such a broad general way that no

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

real thought has been given to the details. Things that no one knows exactly how to handle are already beginning to crop up. For instance, if Roosevelt's recommendations of no competition with private industry, minimum cost of material and a wage scale lower than that prevailing in business are enforced, the great bulk of the projects must be in the rural sections. This is conceded. But the F.E.R.A. reveals that approximately 90 percent of the three and one-half million employables for whom it is proposed to provide jobs live in metropolitan centers. Hence, there is at once the problem of how to join the jobs to the men. In view of these facts, which seem important, I do not suggest that the projects should be selected by Congress, but I do suggest that before they are selected a great deal of thought must be given to this and other problems. Otherwise, the new Public Works Administration will differ from the former one only in its degree of failure. However, there is reason to believe that some attention will be given to this particular problem during the debate on the appropriation.

While we are on the subject of appropriations, I might mention that Congress paid practically no attention to the first blast of the American Liberty League on the subject of the national finances. The administration strategists did not regard it as serious. The problem upon which they are concentrating is how to prevent the two-billion-dollar bonus bill from being passed over Roosevelt's veto. In this, of course, they will have the support of all the industrial and business organizations, of the big metropolitan newspapers, the Liberty League and all kindred associations.

When this support is reinforced by the full weight of the administration, it is difficult to see how the bonus advocates can get a two-thirds majority in both House and Senate. Yet there is a certain amount of alarm among the Democratic leaders, and they believe that the sooner the bonus fight is brought to a head, the better their prospects of decisively beating the bill will be. Hence the word has gone down the line in the House for an early vote. Its passage there, of course, is assured. The real test is in the Senate, and there, too, Senators Robinson and Byrns are determined to push to a quick conclusion.

Clearly the pro-bonus leader in the Senate will be Huey Long. As a matter of fact, Senator Long is coming to be looked upon as the anti-administration leader in that body, and it is generally believed that he will be much more consistent in both criticism and opposition than the Republican leadership, which is still utterly unable to tell in what direction it is going or where it wants to land. So far as direction is concerned, there is nothing uncertain about Huey. He isn't opposed to the Roosevelt program because it goes too far, but because it does not go far enough along the redistribution-of-wealth line. During this session there is going to be a real showdown on this issue in the Senate and it will make some interesting alignments. It is possible that from them an illuminating light will be thrown upon the 1936 campaign. It is still more than a year distant, but even so it is uppermost in the mind of every politician in Washington, from the White House down.

Washington. T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Gold and the Dollar—Another Experiment Gone Wrong—General Johnson Tells All—It's a Centipede

ATTORNEY GENERAL Cummings galloped into the Supreme Court last week, to use on the Court the well known stock-exchange "chaos" argument. There he used the words:

"What was done by the President and by Congress was done only after the most careful consideration."

Somehow, since the Court's horror at the abdication of Congress in the oil measures under N.R.A., the fact that Congress had meditated profoundly on this subject and acted after "careful consideration" seems to be important. The record on the point should be kept straight. The first act in the gold comedy was the embargo on gold shipments in April, 1933, set up under an old wartime act. The second act was the Thomas Amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act, April 28, 1933. Thomas couldn't get a bill for inflation out of committee. Hence he offered an amendment to the farm-control act. In it he merely lumped together the various inflationary schemes of the various inflationary blocs. The amendment did not require inflation. It gave the President permission to use any of the indicated methods—Federal Reserve open-market operations up to $3,000,000,000 to attain the 1926 price level, devaluing the dollar, remonetizing silver. The President opposed these measures, but consented because of the permissive feature. He felt that he could kill the move by refusing to use the delegated powers. But Congress did little or no debating of the matter. It was never considered in committee at all. It got perhaps less consideration in Congress than any important measure adopted in the whole New Deal.

When the act passed, the administration group considered the matter at an end. In Wall Street it was used as the basis of an inflationary bull market that collapsed in about six weeks as soon as it became clear that the President had not taken the matter seriously. And thus ended this act of the farce.

Yet it was under this Thomas Amendment that the President devalued the dollar. What is more, the devaluation took place in pursuance of a plan wholly different from anything the Congress had considered. Indeed, it began without devaluation at all. The President's move was to put into effect the Warren plan, to put up the price of gold in the world market in order to raise prices of agricultural commodities in terms of dollars in that market. That was done in two steps on September 22 and October 23, 1933, when Congress was not in session. It was a brand-new plan which Congress had not debated at all. The President did not devalue the dollar outright. He merely bid up the price of gold, producing a virtual devaluation of the dollar in the world market though the legal gold content remained the same. But he created, suddenly and without conference with Congress or congressional leaders or the public, a critical situation that left Congress

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When Congress met, the President asked power to lower the gold content of the dollar. To refuse then would have put Congress at the mercy of the same "chaos" argument now used on the Supreme Court. I do not say this argument was needed. We don't know. But we do know that Congress gave the matter very scant consideration. The whole subject was railroaded through Congress like most of the other measures of the New Deal. The bill was in the nature of a confirmatory act for steps already taken by the executive, the illegality of which, when he did them, seems now to have been plain.

As for the consideration given by the President himself, it is an open secret that the gold-purchase scheme was launched on the advice of a well known agricultural economist and that the one distinguished monetary economist called in to advise could not approve it. Furthermore, some time later a group of silver Senators were at the White House pressing remonetization. The President, in a merry mood, threw his head back in expansive good humor: "Oh, well," he is reported to have said, "I experimented with gold and that was a flop. Now I'm willing to experiment with silver." Consideration! Personally I think it will be unfortunate if the Supreme Court holds that this government has not the power to rid itself of the debt burden through devaluation, but I also think it unfortunate that there is not some power somewhere in the government to protect the nation from irresponsible authority like this.

The late Jerome K. Jerome, in a London club one night, discoursed solemnly for an hour to Conan Doyle and Henry Irving on the subject of death. When he had finished, Irving looked at him through his shaggy eyebrows with mock gravity. "Jerome," he said, "what a comedian you would have made." Something of the same comment arises in the mind on reading General Johnson's latest formula for salvation to be found in his articles in The Saturday Evening Post.

After all, it throws light on the history of our recovery effort these last twenty-two months, since it was this man who had so large a share in the New Deal when it was being hatched. Everything was so perfectly simple to the General then. After two years of failures, it still is. On the first page, the thing that ruined business was "the paralyzing and persistent force of debt." On page 79, it was overproduction that did it. In the General's next article, the second of his series—The Blue Eagle from Egg to Frying Pan—he has another reason. It was the existence of certain backward areas that worked to wreck our economic order. And the General is completely sure about all of them.

On page 2 the first thing we should have done was to get rid of debt. "No one ever goes in to replace a white marble palace without sending in the wrecking crew." The wrecking crew, the General thinks, should have been easy bankruptcies and defaults. But on page 7, where he is tilting at taxes—his favorite aversion—he insists that we should have cut income taxes, inheritance taxes, halved capital-gains taxes, etc., because the result of the taxes was "constant liquidation."

On page 3 the General is pretty sure we cannot afford graph or two he is announcing that we should "borrow and spend every dollar" needed for emergency and relief. We could have borrowed another $30,000,000,000 during the War. And the inference is plain that we could do the same thing now. But we must not fool much further with the public credit.

The sure way to recovery is the capital-goods industry. The people who invest in capital goods are the rich. But they will not invest so long as they have to pay such large income taxes. Therefore, income taxes should be cut to stimulate the capital-goods industry. Someone should really take the General aside and explain the capital-goods theory to him. It is high time he understood it. I will not examine the precious morsel stated above, but let it stand as one of the prize boners of the depression. But it is at least consistent with the General's scheme, when he first horned in on the N.R.A. job, to impose a ten-percent sales tax.

Thus you will see it is all very plain. We should keep the N.R.A. but should have codes for labor as well as employers. We should have a big army with six months' enlistments for unemployed young men. We should have one big tariff wall around the country. But we should also give a freer hand to his friend George Peek, who is patiently trying to revive foreign trade without much to show for it.

On at least one point the General is sound. He observes that in the early days of the recovery program, or "holy cause," the New Deal was a kind of centipede, and of its seventy legs on one side, no leg knew what the other sixty-nine—or the seventy on the opposite side—were doing. Franklin D. Roosevelt in effect, then, mounted, not a horse, but a centipede and galloped off in a different direction for each of its one hundred and forty legs. Altogether, the General's articles seem to sum up the New Deal as a grand bust. It's mutiny, that's what it is!

JOHN T. FLYNN.

The Reader

All night I sat reading a book,
Sat reading as if in a book,
Of somber pages.

It was autumn and falling stars
Covered the shriveled forms
Crouched in the moonlight.

No lamp was burning as I read.
A voice was mumbling "Everything
Falls back to coldness,

Even the musky muscadines,
The melons, the vermilion pears
Of the leafless garden."

The somber pages bore no print
Except the trace of burning stars
In the frosty heaven.

WALLACE STEVENS.

DIGITIZED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the Labor Front

The Wagner Bill—Has Labor the Right to Organize?—Facts for Clay Williams —Strikebreaker Talmadge

WITH THE announcement from Washington that Senator Wagner is about ready to introduce his new labor disputes bill come several disturbing rumors. The most serious of these is the report that there is a lukewarm, if not frigid, attitude toward the bill on the part of the administration. This news seems almost incredible in view of the utter inadequacy of existing legislation to protect the rights of collective bargaining. It is hardly surprising, however, when considered in the light of the actual labor policy followed by President Roosevelt and his advisers. For that policy is bitterly disappointing to labor and does not even begin to approach the promises contained in Section 7a.

The chief provisions in Senator Wagner's proposed bill make this disparity between administration promise and performance clear. The bill is reported to be somewhat weaker than the measure that failed in the last session, but it is designed to accomplish the following:

1. It would replace the generalized statements of Section 7a with a comprehensive labor statute outlawing specific unfair labor practices, such as company unions and other employer tactics that interfere with free collective bargaining.
2. It would provide for a permanent national labor board with powers comparable to those of the Federal Trade Commission to proceed on its own initiative against violators.
3. It would have the effect of giving legal sanction to the right of majority rule (as defined in the Houde decision) and to similar precedents established in the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board.

These broad purposes of the bill, it will be readily seen, are in effect the irreducible minimum if labor is to be genuinely protected in its right to organize. Yet in recent months neither President Roosevelt, Secretary of Labor Perkins nor New Deal Coördinator Donald Richberg has shown any sympathy, much less enthusiasm, for these proposals. Indeed all three, by their approval of proportional representation, both openly and tacitly, have indicated pretty clearly that they are opposed to the right of majority rule and to the outlawry of company unions. And, of course, the delay and failure of the Department of Justice in prosecuting violators of Section 7a indicate equally clearly that the present administration does not favor the use of the courts to enforce the rights of workers.

According to the Washington correspondent of The New York Herald Tribune, the question of "whether the administration places the Wagner bill on its list of indorsed legislation at this session probably will depend largely upon the developments on the labor front in the next few months." That is hardly encouraging. One would have thought that enough had already happened in labor disputes. Labor will probably take the hint, however, and realize that there is no Santa Claus in the White [illegible]. It will not get a strong labor measure unless it fights for it. In fact, if labor does not fight, there is more than an outside chance that the employer interests will put across their pet idea of restricting the right to strike.

It is not reported that Mr. S. Clay Williams has seen the study on earnings in the tobacco industry, recently made public by the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor. But the study, showing that cigar and cigarette workers are among the most exploited in the country, should be of great interest to Mr. Williams for a number of reasons. In May of last year, the Bureau found that only about one-eighth of the employees in the tobacco stemmeries were earning as much as $12 a week, that one-half were getting less than $10 and that one-tenth were getting less than $5. In many instances the earnings were so low that families had to rely on supplemental emergency relief. (In one tobacco city, two-thirds of the families were receiving supplemental aid during April and May of last year, while the study was made.) The Women's Bureau declares that labor is such a small part of total production costs (stemming operations amount to less than one mill per package of twenty cigarettes) that "wage levels could be raised without making any appreciable difference to the industry."

The cigarette industry, of course, has been relatively prosperous, the four big cigarette companies having paid dividends since 1929, totaling, on the average, $83,000,000 a year. If Mr. Williams, who is not only head of the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, but also chairman of the National Industrial Recovery Board, is not already familiar with these facts, they should be of real interest to him. For in his official post he could be influential in bringing his industry under a code (which it does not yet have) and forcing it to pay adequate wages to its workers. There is only one thing wrong with this idea. Mr. Williams has acted as head of the code committee that has steadfastly refused to submit minimum wages satisfactory to the N.R.A.

In Rossville, Georgia, at the plant of the Richmond Hosiery Mills, Governor Eugene Talmadge is performing once more the strikebreaking service he offered so liberally during the last general textile strike. About 700 hosiery workers at the Richmond plant went on strike a few weeks ago, protesting a ten-percent wage cut. As soon as it became apparent that the strike was effective, the employers (who have been convicted of code violations) appealed to the Governor for National Guardsmen. The request was promptly granted, though there was no disorder whatever, and 350 Guardsmen were sent to Rossville. According to the commanding officers, Adjutant-General Lindley Camp and Colonel L. C. Pope, the soldiers will stay there as long as it is necessary to protect the "God-given right to work." Of course, they are really protecting the strikebreakers whom the company is importing, and are arresting pickets and sending them to a detention camp in Atlanta. For such services, Governor Talmadge was recently honored at a luncheon of the Advertising Club of New York as a great leader of Democracy in the New South.

The N.R.A. is nothing if not solicitous for the sweatshop industries. It found recently that the needlew[illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and, accordingly, approved reductions in the piecework rates for homeworkers. What the new rates are to be has not been made public, but it is interesting to note that the old rates provided for a minimum of $2 per week.

Similarly, the National Industrial Recovery Board refuses to deal constructively with the homework problem here in the United States. It is estimated that there are approximately one million women and children in industrial homework at wages ranging from two to ten cents per hour. It is well known that regulation of home work is virtually impossible and that the only effective way of ending such exploitation is to prohibit it entirely. The latest action of the N.R.A., however, has been to rule that employees in any codified industry engaged in homework on a piece-rate basis should be paid not less than the minimum hourly rate of the code. This ruling is absolutely meaningless, since there is almost no possibility that it can be enforced.

WILLIAM P. MANGOLD.

CORRESPONDENCE

How Does Fascism Rise?

SIR: In your issue of December 19 Walter Wilson, reviewing "Democracy and Military Power," by Silas Bent McKinley, asserts that Dr. McKinley "forgets that the fascists have not gained power in a single country by the use of armed force against armed and organized opposition." May I ask if this is not precisely what occurred in Austria? No student of history can doubt that twenty years ago—when infantry was supreme—the gallant resistance offered by the workers of Vienna and other centers would have been wholly successful.

That the Nazis were able to attain power in Germany without employing force in the military sense in no way vitiates Dr. McKinley's thesis, since this author is at pains to impress the reader that the deciding factor is force *or the threat of force*. . .

Mr. Wilson, arguing against Dr. McKinley's thesis, asserts, further, that "no matter how the instruments of death are perfected, they must be used by human beings against human beings." But does it not matter who controls these weapons and how widespread is their use? . . . Does Mr. Wilson believe that it does not matter if one tank, manned by three well paid thugs, can overawe a thousand farmers armed with rifles—or ten thousand urban workers furnished only with improvised weapons? Certainly there are human beings within the tank, just as there were human beings within the armor of the medieval knight. But if only a few human beings are necessary to obtain (o retain) control of the state, have we not simplified the problem of capitalist dictatorship—under any guise or under any system of nomenclature? . . .

JAMES HENLE,
New York City. President, Vanguard Press.

SIR: Mr. Henle and Mr. McKinley were evidently hard put to it in order to find material to buttress their theory that technological improvement in military weapons is the only logical explanation of the rise of fascism. Else why have they so emphasized the slaughter of Socialist workers in Austria by the late lamented Dollfuss? I contend that the Fascists did not gain power in Austria "by the use of armed force against armed and organized opposition." Socialist leaders helped to put and keep Dollfuss in power as a lesser evil. Thinking to entrench himself more securely, that worthy double-crossed his Socialist leader-friends and by a surprise attack, which he had carefully prepared, he fell upon the unsuspecting Socialist workers and overwhelmed them. In what way can any honest writer contend that the Socialist leaders had armed, organized and prepared their followers for an attempt to gain power through revolutionary action? . . .

If the masses have been made so impotent in a military way, why is it that the war makers led by President Roosevelt are so anxious to obtain the "universal draft"—which they are agitating for under cover of proposals to "take profit out of war"—which will enable them to put into force their mobilization plans within a few days after war is declared? The mobilization plans call for drafting 4,000,000 men almost overnight. In addition they want to conscript labor. The militarists are acting on the theory that it is still man power that wins modern war. . . . It takes a front lines. When seamen, longshoremen, railroad workers, truck drivers and other key workers join in a mass revolt, modern military weapons will begin gathering rust. . . .

New York City. WALTER WILSON.

Beard on Liberalism

SIR: Your statement of the position of The New Republic and your argument for the utility of such a magazine in American society ["Liberalism Twenty Years After," The New Republic, January 23] seem to me sound and convincing, however much one may wish to debate details. Liberalism was in origin not merely an economic revolt of the rising middle classes against feudalism and mercantilism. It was accompanied by the development of scientific inquiry, a war against theological dogmatism and an assertion of human values against brute power in various forms. According to my way of thinking, a liberal is a person who does not imagine himself to be God, endowed with omniscience and capable of saying the right thing and doing the right thing for humanity, always and everywhere.

In every society that is not frozen and on the way to death, there must be some freedom of inquiry, and some freedom for criticism. Unless it is assumed that any particular order is perfect, that abuses cannot exist in it, that those in power at the moment represent the last word in economy, science, art, scholarship and government, then there will be criticism. Without it abuses will go uncorrected and possible improvements in the lot of humanity will go unachieved.

You are right, it seems to me, in assuming that violence, domestic and international, may come, and that arbitrary choice may have to be made, and then in insisting on the effort to preserve certain human values lest everything be trampled underfoot in senseless rage. In holding that class struggles, like wars, may end in the destruction of both parties, Marx warned mankind against possible impoverishment through such conflicts. The means chosen may become destructive of the ends sought.

What you do, as I see your program, is to frame a general picture of the society toward which we appear to be tending, a society on the whole desirable if certain values may be preserved, and then you propose to discuss current affairs with reference to that posited thesis. This acquits you of the charge that you are going "in every direction at the same time," and of the charge that you assume omniscience with respect to every detail—to the strategy and tactics of the hour and day. There is no way of *proving* that your position or my position or any other position involving an interpretation of history is *true*. If everyone who writes or speaks would try to distinguish between what he knows and can prove and what he just loves, hopes and longs for, the intellectual climate would be cleared of a lot of confusing fog. But most of us want to play the role of little gods and to imagine ourselves 100-percent right all the time, on every point, everywhere. In view of the human propensity for dogmatism and prostration before dogmatism, I should like to see a little emphasis at least on the possibilities of human error and the utility of new searches for light on physical and human nature.

New Milford, Conn. CHARLES A. BEARD.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hearst at Harvard

SIR: Hamilton Basso's "Mr. Hearst Sees Red" [The New Republic, January 16] was extremely timely. If any reader is wondering where Mr. Hearst struck next, the answer is Harvard. On January 15 The Boston American, just to add some more fuel to its anti-Red fire, sent James McEnary, a staff member, to investigate secret communistic agitation by the faculty and students. He had a questionnaire ready to submit to reported radicals. Well, I am glad to relate that Harvard got him cold and he left empty-handed. President Conant refused to see him, as did Albert S. Coolidge, lecturer on Chemistry. (Are they making communism in labs these days?) Unsuccessful in his efforts to discover any Red menaces among the faculty, he tried the undergraduates. The head of the Harvard chapter of the National Students' League denied that he knew of any radical professors or any who supported the aims of the N.S.L. The president of the Harvard Liberal Club turned on him with a very pointed denunciation of Hearst and Red-baiters. He hoped that the Hearst organization would not continue to "throw verbal bombs at papier-mache radicals with its customary vigor." The next day The Crimson, the undergraduate daily, published a leading editorial denouncing Hearst newspapers for "pandering to a nation's prejudices" and warned against giving "strength and succor to a fascist movement." For the moment, the Hearst inquisition has left Harvard. Needless to add, The Boston American carried no news of its defeat.

Cambridge, Mass. JULIAN S. BACH, JR.

Does Mr. Lewis Want War?

SIR: I strongly disagree with your editorial "Decision in the Pacific" [The New Republic, January 9], in which you advocate that we abandon China to the tender mercies of Japan and, in addition, grant Japan naval parity which for the United States would be tantamount to committing national suicide.

We should be false to a treaty engagement if we did not by all means in our power maintain in face of Japan's challenge the principle of the territorial and administrative integrity of China which our government, as the principal protagonist of the Washington Treaty, enunciated in 1922. We would be false to the interests of our nationals who desire to trade peacefully with China if we did not uphold in their favor the open-door policy of Secretary Hay. . .

To your claim that the Chinese market is of no great value to us, may I state that nations are accustomed to measuring progress not in days and months but in sections of centuries, and the Chinese market if not very extensive at the present time has, nevertheless, great potentialities for expansion and if, in the indefinite future, the Chinese market becomes valuable to us, we want no Japanese toll gates to bar our way.

As to naval parity—what on earth does Japan, with an area one-tenth the size of ours and material resources in an even lesser proportion, want with a navy equal to ours if not as an instrument with which to attack us at some favorable opportunity? . . .

Like a bolt from the blue came Japan's attack on China in 1894 and the seizure of the Laiotung Peninsula in South Manchuria. Russia kicked her out! Japan, in turn, attacked Russia in 1904 without a declaration of war and obtained as her reward Russia's leasehold of South Manchuria, which was to expire in 1923. Japan forced China in 1915, while the World War was on, to extend that lease for another 99 years, besides extorting many other concessions from helpless China known as the "infamous" Twenty-one Demands.

Japan is the greatest treaty-breaking nation extant. Japan signed two treaties with Imperial Russia in 1910 and 1916 specifically delimiting Japan's sphere of influence and confining it to South Manchuria. Russia, after the Revolution, returned North Manchuria not to Japan but to China. Japan, in 1931, seized that part of Manchuria which was in Russia's sphere of influence. Japan's latest treaty violation is the well known abrogation of the 1922 Washington Naval Treaty.

We have borne insults innumerable from Japan, such as we would brook from no other Power. This country has for years endeavored to settle [illegible]

pacifically, but to no avail, simply because the Japanese, being Orientals, interpret pacific intentions as a sign of weakness and granting them naval parity will only whet their appetites for aggressive adventures up and down the South American coast in violation of our Monroe Doctrine. . . .

New York City. JOHN D. LEWIS.

The Rap from the Oz Club

SIR: Aside from one or two minor errors (such as alluding to "The Patchwork Girl" and "Button Bright" as Ruth Plumly Thompson creations), I believe Mr. Thurber, in his recent and entertaining article on the Oz books [The New Republic, December 12], made a mistake when he announced that "'The Wizard' and 'The Land' are far and away the best." The fact that Mr. Thurber read both books at the age of ten and then at the age of forty read all the others immediately disqualifies him as an adequate Oz commentator. Unless one has read the entire set before the age of twelve he has no business talking about Oz.

Chicago, Ill. MARTIN GARDNER.

Nothing Secedes Like Secession

SIR: In an editorial paragraph of your January 9 issue you regret that so many Southerners regard the North as foreign. Why shouldn't we? A nation independent, at any rate for years, was dissolved by force of arms and forcibly reunited under a sectional dictatorship of wealth. Only for brief intervals has the South had a part in American government since the Civil War. Our state is similar to Cuba's, only they have at least the farce of outward freedom. Liberals all wanted the United States to step out of Nicaragua. Why not get up a campaign to withdraw from these conquered territories of the late Confederacy? Self-determination begins at home. You have a right to criticize Timbucktoo or Andorra, but foreigners are reputedly biased. Louisiana would surely secede if the Marines, etc., were withdrawn. And Mississippi, as Mencken discovered, is alien to his region in morals religion, politics, education, economics.

Aberdeen, Miss. CHARLES G. HAMILTON.

Extracts from Letters

A COMMUNICATION from the Houghton Mifflin Company, publishers, contains the information that they are offering two literary fellowships for 1935. The fellowships, which may be given for any type of literature, are intended for both men and women and will carry an award of $1,000. All applications must be received by May 1, 1935. Further information may be obtained by writing the Houghton Mifflin Company at 2 Park Street, Boston.

According to Dr. Henry Neumann, president of the Gamma Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa at City College of New York, the following resolutions, among others, were adopted at a recent meeting: " . . . We think it our right and duty to characterize as untrue . . . that the students at the College are rowdies or rioters. . . . We call attention to the fact that those who were expelled in recent years have in the main been men with undisputably sincere convictions and admirable courage. . . . It should therefore be obvious to the public . . . that the trouble is largely due to the attitude and actions of Dr. Robinson as president. . . He has consistently pursued a policy of repression and punishment. When this has gone wrong, he has sought to escape responsibility by branding students as disorderly and radical. . . . Let it be resolved that Gamma Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa urges the removal of President Robinson as unfit to be the head of a liberal institution of learning."

Commonwealth College, Mena, Arkansas, writes that exhibits for its Museum of Social Change are pouring in by mail, express, airplane and hitchhike delivery. "Even members of the swanky New York Athletic Club have sent in samples of their threadbare silk lingerie as proof of capitalistic collapse. T[illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Merry England

Laburnum Grove, by J. B. Priestley. Booth Theatre, January 14, 1935.

Accent on Youth, by Samson Raphaelson. Plymouth Theatre, December 25, 1934.

WE HAVE had a run of British plays, silly rot in the novelistic manner—"The Shining Hour" will serve as a good example—and they have often met with success, a sort of puling, dinner-party, I-do-like-a-bit-of-breeding appeal. It must be something like that that has given success to these plays, for certainly they lack the theatrical sense, certainly they muddle sweetly along like a gibberish novel read at a British seashore as a substitute for looking at the waves. That strange brainlessness that we Anglo-Saxons can achieve at will, evidently, pervades such works, and in its way is a comfort. It represents a kind of hang-over of the Victorian—nothing, *per se*, against that—and blesses us with sleigh bells and agreeable vacuity concocted from the remains of a diverse, jerky, fictional epoch.

Both "Laburnum Grove" and "Accent on Youth" are outside the jabbering and the pretensions of these novelette pieces. They are at least definitely theatrical matter. Either in the artifice of the situation or in acting that is not mere casualness and player exhibition, both these occasions offer a frankly theatrical venture. Of the two, "Laburnum Grove" would seem the more natural and convincing, though not so entertaining. Its contrivance is easier and less theatrically recognizable; its characters have more breeze; it is somewhat madder with humorous life. It has more of the sense of willing fun and of giving. "Accent on Youth" has more of the sense of arrangement and of wit. You watch it with more of a feeling of sophisticated agreement on certain themes, and you recognize more easily the stage counterpoint and a certain felicity of tricks. None of these attributes implies for either piece superiority or inferiority, but merely qualities.

In "Laburnum Grove" we have the story of a family whose head turns out to be one of a gang of counterfeiters. He tells this and all its details to his daughter, her suitor, whom he thinks little of, and his brother-in-law, who has already borrowed enough from him and now wants more. Tainted money it would be then. The second act palls a good deal, is in fact almost stupid enough to wreck the evening. This is partly because the playwright takes his stage stride too easily, thinks any sort of fiction good enough and lets himself settle into the little-trusting-wife motif. It is, also, partly because this motif, under Miss Molly Pearson's hands, is too arch, tedious and wasteful to endure. Meanwhile a number of excellent stage effects have been neglected. The encounter of the detective, for instance, who comes to interview the counterfeiter, hoping for information and confession, might have been extended to the boasting brother-in-law, the young garage suitor and the sister-in-law; in each case we should have had corking stage matter. The third act of "Laburnum Grove," halting though it may be, picks up.

For those who took "The Good Companions" seriously which I did not—this new piece of Mr. Priestley's may be so far that pleasant and fresh, an evening of frank, expert cutting up, everybody agreeing to a lively time, like a house-party after dinner. The acting, good or bad, was acting frankly taken as such. It was delightful because it was jolly—in the round, and candidly offered. It was healthy because it was not a mere exhibition of self, pervading the stage and serious with that kind of pubic insistence that acting these days too often manifests. If Mr. Edmund Gwenn, in the leading role, did sometimes too much, what he did was at least not forcing and not fetid exhibitionism, but only gay fun and willingness to please for our sakes as much as for his own. He is a rest from such of the younger players, coming to us via London, as, to take a notable example, Mr. Raymond Massey, who mistakes the theatre for a sort of incidental rotogravure clinic.

Mr. Melville Baxley gave a rather music-hall but capitally droll performance of the brother-in-law; and Miss Elizabeth Risdon played his wife with professional thoroughness, never missing a point and never going wrong.

Mr. Jo Mielziner in his setting—that room with the cultivated ease and the ornate, superimposed door—for "Accent on Youth" has hit the point off nicely; a comedy not inspired but most agreeable in the social sense, a pleasant twisting of the old secretary-theme and of the theme of the artist's confusion between his private and technical motifs, beating himself with his old game and beating his old game with himself. This theme is more readily comic than tragic, but can work both ways. "Accent on Youth" is a play full of charming qualities. In the girl's case it is sometimes moving as well, or is so at least when Miss Cummings plays it. Frankly an artificial comedy arrangement but well sustained in its appeal and with an eye on our actual American world, "Accent on Youth" is never anything but theatre. It keeps to the theatrical point; and every piece of business in the play and in the performance is struck sharply, as if you said, "Watch this." All that effect is smoothly accomplished; it is largely what gives rise to the description of the performance as "finished." Technical smoothness and manifest, admitted artifice are wholesome elements in the theatre, since, whatever else, the theatre language is spoken. Our stage has gravely suffered from a supposed sincerity that is often only a way of denying that there is a theatre language into which all matter and idea, slight or significant, must be translated. It can never be too often repeated to artists that a part of their artistic sincerity consists in a willingness to speak within the medium, not deny it, either pretending that what they give us is life not art, or not knowing the difference, whether that is so or not. The truth is that two-thirds of what we see on the stage is not acting at all. In this particular respect Mr. Ernest Cossart gives a very thoroughgoing performance of the butler, in whose relations with his master the dramatist has found some happy quirks. Mr. Nicholas Hannen as the dramatist hero, plays well, though the opportunities here allow of someone better still. Miss Constance Cummings, a few years ago making her start in a revue, does not always speak English with any style as yet, but is otherwise admirable, very direct, in perfect good taste, and always able to make the point charmingly, and technically well balanced and simple.

STARK YOUNG.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

A Note on Marxian Criticism

PLANS are being laid and a call has already been issued for an American Writers' Congress to be held in New York City on May 1. Two or three hundred of the left-wing novelists, playwrights, poets, critics and journalists are expected to attend the sessions, and many of them will talk about their own problems in relation to the revolutionary movement. The discussion will be largely political, dealing with the best means of mobilizing public sentiment against war and fascism, but literary questions will also be argued. I should guess that the Congress will quarrel and grope its way toward some valuable formulations of opinion and also, perhaps, toward practical activities.

Meanwhile there is one literary question that I hope will be considered calmly and at length. It has to do with the nature and scope of what is variously known as revolutionary or Marxian or proletarian criticism. A great many attacks have recently been made against this type of literary analysis and most of them, perhaps, have been based on misunderstandings. But it is unfortunately true that not all the misunderstandings have been on the side of the attackers. The Marxian critics themselves have been too zealous, have used their method too narrowly and in some cases have carried it too far, thus lending color to the charge that they have neglected literary and human values for the sake of political tactics. This is one of the reasons why the limits of revolutionary criticism should be carefully defined, as well as its effectiveness within its proper boundaries.

One of its sharpest limits consists in the fact that it is sociological rather than psychological. It can explain the social effects of a novel or a drama, and can do so, I think, incomparably better than any other critical method, but it cannot always or accurately explain the personal reason for which the novel or drama was written. This distinction between social and personal, between objective and subjective, can be illustrated by an example taken from American history. The *social motive* for the mass migration that settled the prairie states was the existence of cheap, fertile, unoccupied land beyond the Mississippi. But if a sociologist living in those days had stopped a wagon train and asked each member of it why he was moving westward, he would have uncovered a variety of *personal motives*—one man had been disappointed in love, another was looking "for room to stretch my legs in," still another had robbed a henroost and left town three jumps ahead of the constable. The existence of cheap land played a part in all their decisions, but not the most prominent part; its real importance would be revealed only by statistics and averages—in other words, by one of the methods that Marx used throughout his "Capital." I mention the westward migration because it casts light on a confusion appearing in a good deal of contemporary criticism. One might say, for example, that a certain type of fiction "reveals a petty-bourgeois mentality," and it is possible that the statement would be justified in fact, even though it sounds hackneyed and unconvincing. But if one said that a certain paragraph of a certain novel was written because the novelist had a petty-bourgeois mentality, one would be wrong in three cases out of four. It might have been written because of a death in the family, or a quarrel with his wife, or because he remembered something that a man named Jones had told him in a smoking-car outside of Chicago. If the social effect of it is to strengthen petty-bourgeois ideals—well, that is a different matter entirely, and one that falls within the scope of the Marxian method.

There is, moreover, a whole group of human emotions that are based on biological sorrows and satisfactions—on birth, adolescence, sexual desire, eating, walking in the country, growing old and dying. In poems and stories that deal with these emotions, there may be no social elements whatever. It is of course true that bourgeois ideas appear in unexpected places. In Marcel Proust, for example, there are perhaps a thousand pages dealing with love, which is supposed to be one of the inalienably personal elements in life. Yet Proust's idea of it is so closely involved with the bourgeois sense of possession—love is so much a matter of owning a woman as one might own a fine racehorse, and jealousy is so much the pain of being robbed, of having thieves break into one's house and carry off a valuable work of art—that I am doubtful whether these long passages will be understood in another age when the sense of private property has grown weaker and less all-embracing. In the same way, our ideas of birth and death embody social judgments and are likely to change in the future as they have changed in the past. The fact remains, however, that there is a vast neutral area of literature, neither social nor anti-social, neither revolutionary nor counter-revolutionary. About the only thing that Marxian critics are justified in saying about it—within the limits of the Marxian method—is that if a writer confines himself permanently to neutral subjects he will narrow his scope, impoverish his sympathies and, in the end, diminish his own literary stature.

There is one other boundary set to Marxian criticism, though in this case it is an advantage rather than a limitation. Marxian criticism is not religious. It does not have its Bible, its theory granted by revelation and fixed for all time. It does not demand the surrender of the intellect to an ancient Authority that cannot be contravened; on the contrary it requires that the mind be constantly alert. It does not demand a mystical immolation of one's personality or a mystical union with some collective entity, with church, nation or class; on the contrary it requires that all personal talents be developed to the highest point they can reach. There are, of course, some opposite tendencies in the revolutionary movement itself, and their presence is only natural considering that, as any movement grows larger, it includes many types of heterogeneous thinking. There are even some Communists who talk like characters out of Dostoevsky, transferring his worship of Holy Russia to an equally mystical creation called the Masses. They preach self-abnegation and sometimes, in whispers, they quote the parable of the Grand Inquisitor. It is obvious that their mysticism is absolutely opposed to the Marxian thinking, which emphasizes the value of conscious activity and, in a sense, carries on the spirit of the Renaissance and of the French Enlightenment. There is, however, another theory which holds that individuals should wholly surrender themselves to the Collectivity, should abandon reason for blind obedience to their leaders, should admire books full of self-abnegation, ecstatic darkness and the call of the blood. It is called fascism

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Founder of Pragmatism

Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce, edited by Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss. Volume V: Pragmatism and Pragmaticism. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 467 pages. $5.

THE PRESENT volume in the series, not yet completed, of the published and hitherto unpublished writings of Peirce, is concerned with the topic generally associated with his name, pragmatism. Yet it makes clear what careful students already knew, that his version of pragmatism, the original one, cannot be grasped except as a part of his general philosophical enterprise, together with his logic of relatives. It is likely to be the most widely read of all the volumes in the series. Some of it is not easy to grasp, and yet the reading of it should be obligatory for all philosophers, and somewhat more than optional for all cultivated persons who want to know what the most original philosophical mind produced by this country thought about fundamental matters. The philosophers who have not the patience to follow through his connected exposition of pragmatism can at least derive, from the present volume, ideas of the utmost value independent of the connection in which they occur. The book contains, for example, the most independent and thoroughgoing analysis that I know of the nature of common-sense perception, from which all natural science proceeds and to which it must go back. It occurs, to be sure, in digging for the foundations of his pragmatism. But Peirce was so thorough in laying his foundations that they stand of their own solidity, no matter what doctrinal superstructure is erected thereon.

The first two hundred pages contain a series of lectures delivered in 1903 and are, with articles in The Monist dating from 1905 (also contained in this volume), the most mature expression of his pragmaticist philosophy—as he finally called it to distinguish it from the pragmatism of James and the humanism of Schiller. James referred to the lectures as "flashes of brilliant light relieved against Cimmerian darkness." If, in their published form, the light shines more brightly and constantly, it is not wholly because of the advantages possessed by a printed book, in which one can turn back and forth at will, contrasted with the difficulties in taking in through the ear alone an ordered argument on unfamilar matters. It is also because many intellectual movements, in science as well as in philosophy, have brought Peirce's ideas closer to us. His thought is nearer the mind of today than it was to the mind of thirty years ago. One thing that would give difficulty to any auditor is that after beginning with a statement of pragmatism and the difficulties in the position, he apparently leaves it for three or four lectures, returning to it only toward the close. Another difficulty concerns frequent discussions of the normative sciences and of esthetic and moral good—discussions which, without the whole argument before one, must have seemed irrelevant. But in print there emerges a definite structure that has only minor, largely personal, irrelevancies.

If Peirce's own exposition in seven addresses (one seems to be missing) gave pause to a philosophically trained audience, a reviewer in a short notice can hardly be expected to give an intelligent exposition of the foundation stones upon which Peirce built his doctrine. Yet it is worth while to cite once more his statement of the pragmatic principle. The meaning of terms, propositions, and arguments is always found in the *consequences,* in the practical effects to which they lead. The doctrine that the meaning, say, of a premise is found in its conclusion was revolutionary for logical theory when it was enunciated, and what is implied in it is still far from having found its way into a systematic restatement of logical theory. And if anybody supposes that this failure is a matter of little practical consequence, let him remember that logic is but the statement of what men do when they think, before they reach a belief, and that the method urged by Peirce as a formulation of the method employed to arrive at *scientific* beliefs, has so far had little application in the thinking from which most beliefs in *social and moral* matters issue. To have grasped in its totality the significance of scientific experimental method and to have applied it to a restatement of traditional logic is, I am convinced, an achievement whose importance will stand out more and more as the years go by.

The statement of the pragmatic principle is, however, incomplete without reference to a fundamental point to which the editors properly and clearly direct the reader's attention in their brief Editorial Note. Peirce realized most explicitly that the relationship postulated by his principle—between ideas or judgments and their consequences—cannot be maintained except upon the basis of real continuity in nature. He was peculiarly, and with intellectual conscientiousness, concerned with working out the implications of this idea of continuity. The digging of foundations to which I referred mostly centers about this point. Perhaps the net outcome may be suggested by saying that his conception of continuity leads him totally to reject the notion that the consequences, the practical effects, to which his principle refers are so many independent particular items. On the contrary, they are the establishment of habits of ever increasing generality, of what he terms "concrete reasonableness"—a reasonableness that is concrete because it does not consist in reasoning merely, but in *ways of acting* —that have an ever widening scope and ever deepening richness of meaning. His recurrent emphasis upon that which is esthetically good, and upon logic as ultimately a branch of morals, springs from this source.

I have confined myself to the first collection of papers in the present volume, without touching upon any of the great number of "flashes" that are found in it. I mention one: Experience teaches, Peirce says, by means of a series of surprises. It is through the conflict of our expectations with what happens in actuality that we learn. Even in scientific experiment nothing is learned from an experiment that merely confirms a prior hypothesis; it is the surprise of a new disclosure that counts. This element of surprise, moreover, indicates interaction between the self and the world and so disproves every subjective idealism. Another point that should be instructive to philosophers—though one would be daring indeed who predicted that it will be—is his insistence that while perceptual judgments are forced upon us by processes we cannot ultimately control or criticize, yet there is no logical justification for them as primary logical principles, so that they are less certain intellectually than the conclusions they lead to. I do not know that I can better sum up the pragmatic import of Peirce's pragmatism than by quoting a sentence that occurs near the end of his course of lectures: "The elements of every concept enter into logical thought at the gate of perception and make their exit at the gate of purposive action; and whatever cannot show its passports at both these gates is to be arrested as unauthorized by reason." The notion that thinking is genuine when it is carried on in terms of possible [illegible] is perhaps more readily understood now than when

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Peirce wrote. But we are still a long way from realizing the significance of cumulative continuity in our conception of the kind of action in whose terms we should think.

In concluding this notice of Peirce I cannot refrain from expressing the debt of gratitude that all students owe the editors in their conduct of a laborious task, one almost thankless, indeed, save as it promotes the concrete reasonableness that was the purpose of Peirce's labors.

JOHN DEWEY.

Sin Becomes Symposium

The Sex Life of the Unmarried Adult, edited by Ira S. Wile, M.D. New York: The Vanguard Press. 320 pages. $2.50.

THERE is no telling what effect a "courageous" symposium on a daring subject will have upon its contributors. The present one, for instance, has Robert Morss Lovett injecting a prankish limerick, which rhymes Jesus and venereal diseases, into his scholarly survey of "The Sex Life of the Unmarried Adult in English Literature." The majority of the nine other contributors treat their subject sedately and impersonally. Margaret Mead describes the extra-marital love practices of various primitive folk and N. W. Ingalls, Ernest R. Groves, Mary Beard, Morris L. Ernst and Horace M. Kallen discuss the biological, psychological, economic, legal and moral features of somewhat similar problems among more civilized people —particularly Americans of the present decade. It is not until Ernest W. Burgess explains "The Sociological Aspect of the Sex Life of the Unmarried Adult" and Lorine Pruette interprets some spicy "Modern Portraits" that we get down to individual cases—which is really what most of us expect from an "inquiry" of this type. But since Mr. Burgess confines his attention primarily to the amorous carryings-on of college and high-school students, even his disclosures lack the startling novelty of Miss Pruette's gallery of "brain workers" who over their "not very strong cocktails" exchange such pleasantries as these: "I resent having to spend so much time on sex—two days and nights a week. . . ." "I've had more than twenty women in the last few years and only one or two were any good." "I have had twelve men and none of them was any good." "After I passed thirty I stopped counting."

It is, however, Dr. Robert L. Dickinson of the National Committee on Maternal Health who contributes the most informative paper to the symposium. From his case records he has estimated that in 1895 four-fifths of the unmarried women who came to him for marital advice were virgins, in 1929-30 two-thirds of them were, while in 1933-34 scarcely one-half belong to this steadily decreasing category. Dr. Dickinson does not moan over this change or worry about it. He merely states it as a fact and then asks pointedly: Isn't the modern "premarital sex practice" wherein friendship gradually develops, through successively more intimate physical contacts, into a mature relationship, more wholesome and normal than the "standard procedure, blessed of heaven" which decrees that a few hours after a hectic, public ceremony, "in some strange room or in a narrow berth of train or ship, two tired people, strangers to each other's bodies, are thrust together, made more or less aware of their nakedness, in order that he may boldly make sure that she is a virgin?"

This symposium is shorter than most and for that very reason, perhaps, its contributions are more competent and more relevant.

Boswell at One Remove

Carlyle in Old Age, by David Alec Wilson and David Wilson MacArthur. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 507 pages. $5.

CARLYLE is the supreme example of the reverence that the Victorian Age paid to its leaders. Tennyson, Browning, Newman, George Eliot enjoyed similar honors, but none of them equaled Carlyle in arousing a pervading and intense appreciation of personality and genius. Exaggerated as this was, it marks Carlyle as a historical phenomenon, as the man of his epoch, chosen by the universal suffrage that he despised to be its standard bearer. This fact gives significance to the last fifteen years of his life, when the rectorial address at Edinburgh had shed a sunset light of reconciliation over a career stormy with controversy, and the loss of his wife had touched it with the pathos that the nineteenth century attributed to death. In these years Carlyle sat uninvited in the presence of his sovereign, refused to see the Prince of Wales, declined Disraeli's offer to be made a peer or Grand Commander of the Bath, and was invoked to raise the most powerful voice in England against a repetition of the folly of the Crimean War. The present volume is full of instances of the adoration with which he was regarded. When it was proposed to the redoubtable journalist, W. T. Stead, to visit Carlyle he "almost shrank from so great an honor." When a young lady was helped down the steps of a bus by Carlyle's hand she wrote to a friend: "I will preserve the glove, and perhaps allow you to touch it one day."

The life of Carlyle now concluded is evidence of this contemporary enthusiasm. In the year after Carlyle's death, when David Alec Wilson was a student at Glasgow, he conceived the idea of collecting all that could be found out about Carlyle. This project was long postponed by his appointment to the Indian Civil Service, but after his retirement he devoted himself to interviewing every discoverable person who had known or seen Carlyle, to tracing every fragment of the vast oral tradition to its source, to reëxamining all the documents with a view to correcting the interpretation of Froude. Wilson had the enthusiasm of a hero worshiper. What Carlyle says of the biographer's loving heart in his essay on Boswell's Johnson would apply to him. That he had both the diligence and the naïveté of Boswell is evident. In regard to the unedifying tale of Carlyle's refusal to meet Swinburne without making his opinion known that the poet "sits in a cesspool and adds to it," Wilson pleasantly notes: "This story grew into rumors, several of which D. A. W. tracked in vain. In 1917 it came to him like *manna from the sky* from A. Montgomerie Bell, Banbury, who had heard it at Balliol in 1867."

The inferiority of Wilson's work to Boswell's is obviously due to the discrepancy between the two writers in genius and opportunity, but in part it must be laid to the limitations of the subject. Carlyle resembled Doctor Johnson in personal eccentricity, in the positiveness of his beliefs and the oracular style in which he presented them, in a low opinion of the human race and human happiness mitigated by a certain grim humor, but he was Johnson's inferior in originality and especially in variety. It has been noted how often Carlyle repeats himself in his writings. Indeed his main ideas are astonishingly few, constantly recalled like the themes of a symphony. This repetition characterized his talk. Especially in his last period his conversation fell

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mortality, preoccupation with his own death. Carlyle's reputation has suffered more than most from surplusage. In addition to his thirty volumes, there came after his death the reminiscences and memorials, followed by Froude's long biography with its hideous trail of controversy, and several volumes of letters in which Jane's "me too" became audible. To all this Wilson has added his industrious compilation, which became more copious as he approached his own time and met more of Carlyle's surviving contemporaries. In this last volume Mr. MacArthur, who completes his uncle's work, is conscientious in transcribing all of the visible and audible in Wilson's notes. Even a pious Carlylean may wish that he had spared something of the repetitious and the trivial.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

Musa Dagh

The Forty Days of Musa Dagh, by Franz Werfel. Translated by Geoffrey Dunlop. New York: The Viking Press. $3.

THE DESCRIPTION of collective suffering, the brutal reality of physical pain such as only the most oppressed among the oppressed can experience, does not often appear in a popular novel. Perhaps the reason is that few writers have the gift for making such a story as palatable as novels are supposed to be. Werfel undoubtedly has this gift. His dramatic sense is powerful, he is an artist in the use of contrast and suspense. In his book, the opposition between the Young-Turk politicians who resolve to exterminate the Armenians in cold blood, and an innocent peace-loving people fighting for their lives, is impressive. The irony he directs against the "warrior" race, resentful of their defeat by a group of intellectuals and merchants, is biting and timely. In addition, everything that would stir a normal heart is skillfully woven into the story—raids, reckless heroism, treachery, marital betrayal and ingratitude, landscapes, customs, atheistic villains, the ups and downs of a hopeless battle, exalted romance and a final miraculous rescue.

And yet, despite this great technical success, and perhaps partly because of it, Werfel's novel fails as a work of art, or at least as the kind of art its subject could have inspired. It does not convey any basic meaning; it does not create a significant character. The force of the book is dispersed, and it is not difficult to see why.

A historical event such as the attempt to murder an entire race belongs to a class of phenomena that creates and shapes philosophies and makes one penetrate into the reality of life more deeply than would any individual experience. But for Werfel the Armenian tragedy has become a literary theme, used to illustrate an essentially shallow sort of mysticism. "The inexplicable in us and above us" is the leading motive of the story; mystery is the essence of the universe, and all history is shrouded in this pantheistic fog. The tragedy of a persecuted people is lost in a biological interpretation, in the rhetoric of blood-and-soil symbolism. There is a certain appeal to action in the novel; but this action is based on a blind reflex rather than on understanding. "I don't want to live. . . . I want to fight. . . . I want to kill as many Turks as we have cartridges," says Werfel's hero. And in the end even this feeble appeal is erased by the author's humanistic pessimism, which asserts [illegible] and thunders against progress. "Human more unpalatable." Ultimately, "progress" (*i. e., time*) and mysterious cosmic forces are made responsible for the disaster. And what a consolation to read that "Our father in heaven created these [racial] differences between us in order to teach us love."

The devastating influence of Werfel's mysticism is even more apparent in his treatment of characters. Gabriel Bagradian, the hero whose inner evolution is the other great subject of the novel, is pictured as a man of high culture. Before the War he is living in Paris, married to a Frenchwoman. By accident he finds himself in Turkey when the persecutions begin, and there decides to share the fate of his brethren. This conversion of the hero is a significant theme that Werfel has befogged. Gabriel's inner struggle is entirely subconscious; it is a "vague uneasiness" that prevents him from taking French citizenship. He is "seized" by wishes. Not he, but the "blood of his ancestors" makes the important decisions. "It's in my bones. . . . My ancestors in me . . . can feel it. My whole body feels it." He takes a Turkish bath and then inexplicably "feels the day's impenetrable significance." His son, Stephan, "inherits with his blood" the patriotic emotion. And so on, until Gabriel's end, when he voluntarily refuses to be saved and is killed on his son's grave. The entire progress of Bagradian's soul is accomplished outside of the intellect; its every stage is a victory of the dark over the light, of the local over the universal, of family over society, of blood over culture. And this constant sacrifice of the inner lucid debate (which makes for the greatness of the great nineteenth-century novels) for the sake of a mystic appeal to the "blood"—this psychology kept in the domain of the subconscious, and this eloquence that instead of analyzing attempts to move and edify—mark a real regression of the novelist's art.

NORBERT GUTERMAN.

Books in Brief

A Shorter History of England, by Hilaire Belloc. New York: The Macmillan Company. 675 pages. $3.

MR. BELLOC'S Catholic bias imparts to his sketch of English history a very distinct character, having strong as well as weak points. When, for example, Mr. Belloc says that the transformation in the later Roman empire of slaves into serfs proceeded under church influence, he is, to put it mildly, exaggerating; slaves began to be attached to the land when the source for the supply of slaves—conquest—dried up. When his bias impels him practically to deny that there was an Anglo-Saxon conquest of Britain, and to affirm an unbroken continuity between Roman and later Britain, it cannot be said that his laborious argument sheds much new light on the course of English history. On the other hand, his sympathy with things medieval gives him an insight that is lacking in historians of the liberal tradition. Thus he sees through the myth of Magna Carta, which was a feudal document and "lost all its meaning as the feudal system decayed and Parliament took the place of the Feudal Council." In the Hundred Years' War he sees, not a war between England and France, but between French nobles on opposite sides of the Channel for the possession of France. In the English Reformation he sees the hand of a new class of millionaire landowners. From that point on, he dwells on the determining power of wealth in the fashioning of English history. The Glorious Revolution definitely establishes the rule of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"THE ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF THE NEW DEAL *is a tremendous little book. It's a call to the American people which, I think, great multitudes will hear. I predict it will be discussed by the Brain Trust, the President and his Cabinet, and the Congress in Washington."*

—LOUIS ADAMIC.

THE ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF THE NEW DEAL

by BENJAMIN STOLBERG and WARREN JAY VINTOW

A sound and clear summary, with no words wasted, with the resonant common sense of a pamphleteer like Tom Paine. Thousands of people have been anxious for just such a book, and this one is, perhaps, as challenging a document as has appeared in this country for many years.

Just out, $1.00

HARCOURT, BRACE & COMPANY
383 MADISON AVE., NEW YORK

The Special Classified Rate of The New Republic is:

ONE INCH
1 insertion $4.00

ONE INCH
3 insertions $3.50

ONE INCH
6 insertions $3.00

Larger space proportionately more. Smaller space down to a half-inch proportionately less. An inch gives you about 60 words, set solid in 6 point.

The Special Three-Line Minimum Ad Costs $1.00

Three-line ad, 20 to 24 words, including address, set in 5 point, $1.00. Extra lines 34c additional.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49th St.
New York, N. Y.

BARGAINS IN BOOKS

Offerings of America's Oldest Mail Order Book House

UP TO 75% OFF FORMER PRICES

1. **THE WORKS OF FRANCIS RABELAIS.** Edited by Albert Jay Nock and Catherine Rose Wilson. The Urquhart-LeMotteux translation. "In all probability it will remain for many years the definitive edition of Rabelais."—*Sat. Review.* 2 vols., total of 952 pages, *84 illustrations.*
Formerly, $15.00 **Ass'n Price $4.95**
2. Lytton Strachey's **PORTRAITS IN MINIATURE.** A later volume, in the same vein as "Books and Characters." "A delight to devotees of belles lettres!"—*Forum.* 214 pages.
Formerly, $2.50 **Ass'n Price 98c**
3. Catherine Carswell's **THE LIFE OF ROBERT BURNS.** "A definitive biography of and monument to Scotland's greatest poet.—*Horace Gregory.* 411 pages, *4 photographs.*
Formerly, $2.75 **Ass'n Price 98c**
4. Catherine Carswell's **THE SAVAGE PILGRIMAGE: A NARRATIVE OF D. H. LAWRENCE.** "Will doubtless have to be consulted by all future students of the man."—*American Mercury.* 296 pages.
Formerly, $5.00 **Ass'n Price $2.49**
5. Ozenfant's **FOUNDATIONS OF MODERN ART.** The aesthetics of the most advanced schools of art. 352 pages, *175 illustrations.*
Formerly, $5.00 **Ass'n Price $2.49**
6. **NEW DIMENSIONS: THE DECORATIVE ARTS OF TODAY IN WORDS AND PICTURES.** By Paul T. Frankl. Chapters on fabrics, modern furniture, lighting, city architecture, etc. 88 pages text. *128 pages of photographs.*
Formerly, $10.00 **Ass'n Price $1.89**
7. **MODERN ARCHITECTURE.** By Henry-Russell Hitchcock. The growth of modernism traced from 1800 to the present. 252 pages, *59 illustrations.*
Formerly, $5.00 **Ass'n Price $1.69**
8. **MODERN EUROPEAN BUILDINGS.** By F. R. Yerbury. *150 full-page plates* from specially taken photographs, a collection of the finest examples of the new art of Europe.
Formerly, $5.00 **Ass'n Price $2.69**
9. **WRITE IT RIGHT.** By Ambrose Bierce. A little blacklist of literary faults, by America's foremost master of style. Useful, witty. Interesting to those who like to speak, write and think precisely.
Ass'n Price $1.00
10. **THE FRESCOES OF DIEGO RIVERA.** *139 full-page reproductions.* Portraits, sketches and frescoes in Mexico City and Chapingo.
Formerly, $10.00 **Ass'n Price $2.69**
11. **THE ANATOMY OF ART.** By Herbert Read. *Illustrated.* The answer to the question, "What Is Art?"
Formerly, $3.00 **Ass'n Price 98c**
12. **THE REAL ARABIAN NIGHTS.** Complete and *unexpurgated.* In 8 beautifully illustrated volumes.
Formerly, $66.00 **Ass'n Price (set) $14.88**

SATISFACTION GUARANTEED OR YOUR MONEY BACK

THE UNION LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, Est. 1884
367-373 Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y.

Gentlemen: I enclose $..... Please send the books encircled below:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

☐ **PLEASE SEND FREE 36-PAGE CATALOG NO. 257-NR.**

Name .....

Address .....

SILENT RECITALS!

Once a week you can experience the thrill of a journey through a new world of visual beauty by attending a Clavilux Recital played by Thomas Wilfred in the Recital Hall of the Art Institute of Light at Grand Central Palace, 480 Lexington Avenue. Tickets one Dollar. Clavilux? Look it up in the 14th edition Britannica!

To reserve seats and for information, call EL 5-4788

LECTURES

COOPER UNION
Dept. of Social Philosophy
(Formerly The People's Institute)
IN THE GREAT HALL
8th Street and Astor Place—At 8 o'clock
Admission Free

Friday, February 1st
EVERETT DEAN MARTIN
"What Is Social Justice? Aristotle."

Sunday, February 3rd
PROF. EDWARD G. SPAULDING
"The Nature of Science."

Tuesday, February 5th
PROFESSOR LYMAN BRYSON
"Security in a Pre-Capitalistic System."

MOVING PICTURE

FILM & PHOTO LEAGUE *presents*
WAX WORKS
Jannings -:- Viedt
POTEMKIN
JANUARY 26, 1935
Two Showings—Promptly at 7 and 9:30 P. M.
NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH
66 West 12th St. New York City
Tickets: 75c at door; 50c in advance.
Available at:
Mayfair Bookshop, 1 E. 47th St.; Workers' Bookshop, 50 E. 13th St.; Film & Photo League, 31 E. 21st St. Columbia Bookstore, Columbia University

LECTURE

Communism:
A Discussion of Basic Principles
By GEORGE SISKIND
Educational Director, New York District, Communist Party
At Membership Meeting of the PRESS LEAGUE
Admission to non-members: 25c
JAN. 28—8:15 P. M.
Room 12, 168 W. 23 St.

GRAMOPHONE RECORDS

MUSIC LOVERS—100,000 of the finest records in the world on sale at 50c & 75c per record (value $1.50 & $2). The Symphonies, Chamber Music, Operas, etc., of BACH, BEETHOVEN, BRAHMS, MOZART, WAGNER, etc. MAIL ORDERS, CATALOGUE. THE GRAMOPHONE SHOP, Inc., 18 E. 48th St., New York City.

ORANGES FOR SALE

Oranges, sweet, juicy, sun-ripened on trees; picked, shipped same day. Delivered express prepaid, $3.50 bushel basket. Tangerines, $3.75; Grapefruit, $3.00. Satisfaction guaranteed. **A. H. Burket, Sebring, Fla.**

GENERAL

WHY BE DISCONTENTED? Or defeated by environment? Or handicapped by . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cratic), whose distinctive creations are the Bank of England and the National Debt. England's amazing growth in the nineteenth century is identified with the growth of industrial capitalism, in which she led all other nations. Irish affairs are treated more fully than is usual with English historians, and Mr. Belloc shows the influence of the banks in framing the Irish Land Acts. H. S.

Our Next Step: A National Economic Policy, by Matthew Woll and William English Walling. New York: Harper and Brothers. 209 pages. $2.

The usefulness of this little treatise on national planning is somewhat diminished by a very unfortunate defect. The authors—Vice-President Woll of the A.F. of L. and his literary aid, Mr. Walling—use words so strangely that it is difficult to discover just what they are really talking about. Thus, in one breath they call the New Deal a "revolution" and in the next a "conservative, pragmatic" way of facing realities. They oppose the maldistribution of wealth, yet they see "no need of interfering with the private ownership of capital nor with 'reasonable' profit" on investments. The government, they argue, must assert greater control over business, but "our existing political system, with *radical* innovations, but with comparatively few *vital* amendments, will amply serve." Such propositions as these, it must be confessed, are not so explicit as they might be. Indeed, they place the authors in the strange position of advocating radical change within conservative bounds, a palpable absurdity. Of the labor problems arisen under Section 7a—strikes, Weirton Steel, etc.—no mention is made; none, that is, except in the index where, under "Strikes," one is told to see "Labor Organization" and then, under "Labor Organization," to see "Strikes." W. P. M.

Indian Patchwork, by Edward and Mary Charles. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 304 pages. $2.

This is a collection of notes from the diary of Edward Charles, an Englishman who was principal of a Hindu-Moslem college in Central India. In collaboration with his wife, he has made a record of his experiences and reactions to academic life in India during the year 1927. The heat, bickerings with the native faculty, Hindu superstitions, student strikes and college routine—these irritations are treated with a light, occasionally semi-humorous touch. Yet there is a serious underlying note, a kind of wail at the futility and the contortions of Indian mentality. Though most of the sketches are of minor significance, cumulatively they point up the problems of British administration in the academic sphere. The writers seem to lean more sympathetically toward the Moslem element, and feel that the center of dissension is predominantly Hindu. Their book is an informative contribution to an aspect of life that rarely receives extended treatment. H. E. W.

Contributors

H. N. Brailsford is the London correspondent of The New Republic and the author, among numerous other books, of "Property or Peace," published last fall by Covici-Friede.

Wayne Gard is a member of the staff of The Dallas News. He wishes to explain that his discussion of the oil situation does not necessarily reflect the editorial views of that newspaper.

T. A. Bisson, for four years a teacher of English in China, was in 1927-28 co-editor of The China Outlook. He is now a specialist on Far Eastern affairs on the research staff of the Foreign Policy Association.

John Lehmann, one of the younger English poets, was born in 1907. He is the author of one book of poetry, "A Garden Revisited," and one book of poetry and prose, "The Noise of History."

Wallace Stevens, poet and lawyer, is the author of a book of verse, "Harmonium." He lives in Hartford, Connecticut.

John Dewey is now at work on a book about the theory of logic. His most recently published books are "Art as Experience" and "A Common Faith."

Norbert Guterman is a native of France who now lives in New York. He contributes articles and literary reviews to various publications.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Herman Simpson, William P. Mangold and Harry E. Wedeck.

THE THEATRE GUILD *presents*
MAXWELL ANDERSON'S play
VALLEY FORGE
with PHILIP MERIVALE
GUILD THEATRE, 52nd Street, West of Broadway. Evenings 8:40. Matinees, Thurs. and Sat. 2:40.

S. N. BEHRMAN'S play
RAIN FROM HEAVEN
with JANE COWL
and JOHN HALLIDAY
GOLDEN THEATRE, 45th Street, West of Broadway. Evenings, 8:30. Mats. Thurs. and Sat. 2:30.

Evenings—BALCONY: 75 Seats at $1.00
75 Seats at $1.50 75 Seats at $2.00
ORCH. 250 Seats at $2.50 250 Seats at $3.00
ALL PLUS TAX.
"The top-drawer of tunefulness and jollity."*Gabriel, American*
LIFE BEGINS at 8:40
Bert LAHR Ray BOLGER Luella GEAR Frances WILLIAMS
A JOHN MURRAY ANDERSON PRODUCTION
WINTER GARDEN B'way & 50th St., Eves. 8:40 Mats. THURS. & SAT. $1 TO $2.50

THE THEATRE GUILD *presents*
(in association with Charles B. Cochran)
for a limited engagement
ELISABETH BERGNER *in*
ESCAPE ME NEVER
by MARGARET KENNEDY
SHUBERT THEATRE, 44th Street, West of Broadway
Evenings, 8:30. Mats. Thurs. and Sat., 2:30

THEATRE UNION'S NEW HIT
SAILORS OF CATTARO
"Congratulations! One of the best things in town."
—Stark Young, *New Republic.*
"A genuinely fine play and an exciting one."—*World Telegram.*
Prices: 30c to $1.50 — Eves 8:45 — Mats. WED. & SAT., 2:45

LECTURE
JOHN **STRACHEY**
SUNDAY
JANUARY 27, 1935
3 P. M.
Only Lecture at Popular Prices This Season
on
"THE NATURE OF CAPITALIST CRISIS"
at
ST. NICHOLAS PALACE
69 WEST 66th STREET, NEW YORK CITY
Tickets: 25c 35c 50c 75c
Auspices:
Tickets at:
WORKERS' BOOKSHOPS
50 E. 13 St., New York City
369 Sutter Avenue, Brooklyn

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED